

A STUDY OF SUFFIX RIME IN OTFRID'S EVANGELIENBUCH

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

THOMAS HOWARD FOWLER

BALTIMORE

1905

A STUDY OF SUFFIX RIME IN OTFRID'S
EVANGELIENBUCH



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41552322_0077

A STUDY OF SUFFIX RIME IN OTFRID'S EVANGELIENBUCH

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

THOMAS HOWARD FOWLER



BALTIMORE
1905



The Lord Baltimore Press
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	7
CLASSIFICATION OF THE RIMES	8
THE ULTIMA	10
PENULTIMATE RIME	18
PENULTIMATE-ANTEPENULTIMATE RIME	42
ANTEPENULTIMATE RIME	44
OTHER OLD HIGH GERMAN POEMS	48
IDENTICAL RIME	49
SUMMARY	62
VITA	63

A STUDY OF SUFFIX RIME IN OTFRID'S EVANGELIENBUCH

INTRODUCTION

The earliest important treatment of Otfrid's rime was that of Wilhelm Grimm in 1850, under "Zur Geschichte des Reims," found in his *Kleinere Schriften* 4, 159 f. So far, however, as Otfrid is concerned, the major part of the work has to do only with identical rime, so that it can not be regarded as a complete study of the Old High German author.

In 1874 Zarncke published an article entitled "Die Reime des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts" in the *Berichte der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 26, p. 34 f., but as this study is almost wholly limited to rimes in which at least one word is a root syllable, the sections devoted to Otfrid do not in any sense present a full or satisfactory view of the entire system of rimes.

Still later, in *ZfdA.*, 16, p. 117 f., Wilmanns, in what may be regarded as a continuation of Zarncke's method, treated those rimes in which one or both words are wholly root syllables, styling these stem rimes; other sorts of rime he regarded as suffix rime, although there is no good reason why rimes extending over more than one syllable, such as *frōno: scōno*, should be classified as suffix rime rather than stem rime. The term is, however, a convenient one, and for lack of a better has been retained in the following pages.

Paul, in the second edition of the *Grundriss* II, 2, p. 109 f., and Koegel, *Deutsche Litteraturgeschichte* I, 2, 23 f., have also made contributions to the study of rime in Otfrid, but neither represents a detailed study of suffix rime, and the point of view from which they regard many of the rimes is, in the opinion of the writer, not altogether correct.

In the following pages, therefore, a study of suffix rime in Otfrid is proposed, including:

- I. Penultimate rime. (Type *frōno: scōno*)
- II. Penultimate-antepenultimate rime. (Type *folgētun: woltun*)
- III. Antepenultimate rime. (Type *worahta: forahhta*)

A further detailed discussion of root syllable rime is not deemed necessary, and it will be considered only in connection with identical rime.

One of the main questions which the present investigation will aim to settle is: What minimum amount of similarity in the penultimate or antepenultimate syllable will justify us in asserting the existence of penultimate or antepenultimate rime? In order to answer this question the rimes will be classified under various rubrics, that they may thereby lend themselves more easily to observation, and that interesting facts may thus be brought to notice. All evidence of varying rime usage in the different books will be gathered and subjected to scrutiny, with the intention of offering it as a contribution to the much mooted question of the order in which the various books were written.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE RIMES

The statistics given by Wilmanns¹ for so-called stem rime are not entirely accurate. The correct figures for this as well as for suffix rime are hence given below:

	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
Length.	1240	1244	1576	1572	1472	= 7104
Root syllable rime.	261	383	492	462	406	= 2004
	21%	30.8%	31.2%	29.4%	27.6%	= 28.2%
Suffix rime.	971	861	1084	1109	1066	= 5091
	78.2%	69.2%	68.8%	70.6%	72.4%	= 71.7%

In this connection it should be remembered that there are eight instances of rimeless verses² in Book I, and one in Book IV. From these figures it will be seen that Book V, and especially

¹ ZfdA., 16, 117 f.

² Koegel, Deutsche Litteraturgeschichte I, 2, 23 f.

I, contain the smallest amount of root syllable rime, and therefore have a larger proportion of suffix, i. e. penultimate and antepenultimate rime.

Suffix rime includes, then, 71.7 per cent of the total number of rimes, so that the ratio of its occurrence to that in which one or both riming words are root syllables is about $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 1.

As penultimate and antepenultimate rime thus assume the major rôle in Otfrid the question naturally suggests itself why they have never been examined with the same care with which root syllable rime has been studied.

The answer may be found in Zarncke,¹ who, after a discussion of the type just mentioned, remarks:

“Neben der reimenden letzten Hebung lässt nun Otfrid auch gerne noch die voraufgehende Silbe oder mehrere Silben mitreimen, so gerne, dass diese zweisilbigen (und dreisilbigen) Reime bei ihm die Ueberzahl ausmachen, und recht eigentlich den Charakter seiner Reime bestimmen. Eine Statistik derselben würde nicht ohne Interesse sein, aber beschränkende Bestimmungen lassen sich nicht feststellen, da das ganze Farbenspiel vom vollständigen Zusammenklingen bis zur absoluten Reimlosigkeit durchlaufen wird, so dass man kaum sagen kann, wo die Grenze festzustellen, wo noch ein ungenaues Mitreimen, wo bereits Reimlosigkeit anzunehmen sei. Nur das Eine wird sich aus statistischer Beobachtung geben: offenbar hat sich Otfrid allmählig in den dem Ohre schmeichelnden vollen oder doch nahezu vollen Zweiklang hineingefunden. Man vgl. z. B. die Reime in I. 4, vielleicht das erste Kapitel das Otfrid dichtete, mit denen in der Widmung an Ludwig. Die im Anfange nur nicht verschmähten Doppelreime sind allmählig immer mehr die Regel geworden.”

Now, while the above-mentioned difficulty is a real one, it is not so insurmountable as Zarncke suggests; for with the material before one, and classified properly according to both the accurate and inaccurate types, it is possible to arrive at results that not only afford a better understanding of the nature of penultimate and antepenultimate rime, and of the principle involved in these rimes, but that also furnish a standard by

¹ Berichte der sächsischen Gesellschaft 26, 39.

which to judge to what extent inaccuracies of rime are compatible with the riming character of the syllable in question.

THE ULTIMA

In discussing the rimes that extend over two or three syllables, it is most convenient and logical to start with a consideration of the ultima, especially since this syllable is almost always accurately rimed.

The exceptions, where the vowels are entirely different, are quite rare, and the latter are in all cases¹ followed by the consonant *n*, while the initial consonants of these syllables are usually identical. Cf. *gisuāson* : *muasun*; *fārōn* : *ōrun*. In these few instances² it is, then, the consonants that supply the element of identity for rime in the final syllable. We may distinguish, therefore, three classes of rimes in so far as the ultima is concerned:

I. The initial consonants of the ultima are identical. Cf. *zīti* : *nōti*; *forahta* : *worahta*.

II. The initial consonants of the ultima are not identical but similar. Cf. *wāri* : *scōni*; *rigilōn* : *segenon*.

III. The initial consonants of the ultima are neither identical nor similar. Cf. *biginnan* : *belgan*; *hōhi* : *dāti*.

Of these three classes I is by far the largest, including 4265 rimes, that is 83.8 per cent of the total number of suffix rimes. The predominance of such rimes in which the final syllables are identical is not to be ascribed to accident, but is due to a conscious effort on the part of Otfrid, as can be shown from a study of his synonyms. Let us take, for instance, the words *ābulgi*, *zorn*, and *heizmuati*, meaning in general "anger."

An examination of the rimes of *heizmuati*, which are 4 in number, shows that they are all with *nōti*, i. e. with a word whose final syllable is identical with *heizmuati* (I 20, 2; III 20, 129; IV 19, 57; IV 30, 8). Otfrid might have used *ābulgi* : *nōti*, and the former word occurs just as often in the text as *heizmuati*, being used twice in rime out of a total of 4 in-

¹ Cf. Erdmann's large edit. of Otfrid. Introd. LXVIII.

² About 12, so few that they may be included in the three classes immediately following.

stances, but as this rime would have destroyed the identity of the final syllable he refrained from doing so.

Likewise, of the two rimes of *zorne*, one is with *wanne* (IV 30. 9), according to the above principle, which would have been violated had either *ābulge* or *heizmuote* been used instead; the other is *zorne:horne* (IV 26. 2), an example of accurate penultimate rime.

Again, we have the group *gāhī*, *snellī*, and *īla*, meaning "haste" or "quickness," and of these *gāhī* occur 17 times in rime, 15 of which are accurate penultimate rimes. The other two are *gāhī:wīhī* (I 8. 13), and *gāhī:hōhī* (V 4. 25). In either place *snellī* could have stood in rime instead of *gāhī*, but such a rime would have done away with the identity of the final syllables, and its absence may be explained on this ground.¹

The same observation may be made in the case of the verbs (*gi*)*gāhen* and (*gi*)*īlen*, *gi**gāhen* in some inflectional form appearing in rime 8 times, 6 of which are accurate penultimate rimes, the other 2 being *gi**gāhe:gi**hōhe* (I 1. 32), and *gi**gāhen:gi**hōhen* (III 16. 20). If we substitute in the one case *gi-īle* and in the other *gi-īlen*, it will appear why Otfrid did not use these latter forms.

Again, the group of words signifying "sin, crime," which are: *sunta*, *meina*, *akust*, *missidāt*, *ubarmuatī*, and *fravilī*. The rimes of *sunta*, which are 12 in number, are of the accurate penultimate type of rime, as *sunta:wunta*, with but 4 exceptions, 3 of which come under consideration here. They are *worton:suntōn* (II 7. 14; IV 22. 34) and *scolta:suntā* (I 4. 12). *Meinōn* and *meinā* are in order here in the place of *suntōn*, *suntā*, but the rule for the identity of the final syllable interferes with their use. In a similar manner, there are 8 rimes of *ubarmuatī*, of which 6 are accurate penultimate rimes, while the remaining 2 are *ubarmuatī:nōti* (II 5. 7), and *ubarmuatī:nōti* (I 18. 13). Had *fravilī* been substituted for *ubarmuatī* it would have resulted in a difference between the final syllables.

¹ Of course no form of *īla* could have been used here, as it belongs to a declension in which the final vowel is always different from that of the other two words of this group.

We have in Otfrid two verbs meaning "to think," *thenken* and *wānen*, and there are 11 instances of rimes of the former with forms of *wirken*, in which some form of *wānen* might have been used, instead of *thenken*, had the initial consonant of the final syllable been the same.

Again, the group *liob*, *diuri*, *drūt*, *gimuati*, *zeiz*, signifying "dear." There are 9 rimes of *diura*, *gimuati*, and *zeiz* in various inflectional forms that concern us, namely: *diura*: *wāra* (IV 35. 19; V 23. 120), *diuron*: *wāron* (IV 33. 35), *diuri*: *māri* (I 6. 16), *diuri*: *hēri* (IV 4. 22), *diuru*: *māru* (V 25. 22), *gimuati*: *heroti* (IV 11. 23), *gimuate*: *biete* (III 6. 30), *zeizo*: *suazo* (II 8. 15). In all these 9 rimes some one of the other words of this group might have been employed but for the striving after identity of final syllable described above.

Of verbs of "saying" there are 11 ultima rimes of forms of *sagēn* with other words, in which, if some other verb of "saying" as *gehan* or *sprechan* were substituted, the final syllables would no longer be identical.

There is also one rime of *redino*: *forasagōno* (II 18. 3), for which *redio*, of like meaning though of less frequent occurrence, could be used; and likewise a rime-pair *irzelitun*: *thingōtun* (V 23, 237), where *sprāchun* would express the same idea as the first rime word. In all these cases the substitutes seem to be avoided intentionally.

As a final group may be mentioned the adjectives *ziari* and *scōni*, meaning "beautiful." In some one of its inflectional forms *scōni* occurs 9 times in rime where some form of *ziari* would also be in place: *scōni*: *gisiuni* (I 4. 24), *scōni*: *ana-wāni* (I 4. 48), *scōni*: *wāni* (II 7. 49), *scōne*: *zuēne* (V 7. 13; V 18. 2; V 20. 9), *scōnaz*: *seltsānaz* (V 23. 175), *scōnes*: *gisiunes* (I 12. 32), *scōniu*: *indāniu* (II 6. 19). The adverb *scōno* similarly stands in rime with *sino* (IV 7. 81), where the adverb *ziaro* would have violated the regular rule.

Many other synonyms might be quoted to illustrate the point in question, and in all these Otfrid's effort to secure identity of the final syllable can be clearly shown, so that the predominance of these rimes cannot be due to mere accident, but must be the result of a consistent plan.

It remains to discuss classes II and III, which contain together 826 examples, and are, therefore, much smaller in number than the preceding, the ratio being nearly 5:1.

In the first of these classes the initial consonants of the final syllables, though not identical, are similar. This class includes 428 rimes, that is over one-half of the cases in which the final syllable is not identical. Here are to be classed first of all the rimes of the nasals and liquids with each other, such as *rīme: zuēne*, *scōni: wāri*, etc.

The similarity of *n*, *l*, *r*, and *m* to each other as well as the frequency with which they rime, the one with the other, proves that Otfrid sought such rimes, wherever he could not secure identity of the final syllable.

The statistic is as follows:

EXAMPLES

<i>l: n</i> = 104	<i>gimeinit: gideilit</i>
<i>l: m</i> = 5	<i>arme: wolle</i>
<i>l: r</i> = 36	<i>zioro: stuolo</i>
<i>n: r</i> = 40	<i>scōni: wāri</i>
<i>m: r</i> = 21	<i>gisāmi: wāri</i>
<i>m: n</i> = 29	<i>armon: hornon</i>
Total, 235	

Noticeable is the frequency of the rimes of *l: n* and the rarity with which Otfrid joins *l* and *m* in rime. The consonants occur in rime in the following order: *n* 173 times; *l* 145; *r* 97; *m* 55. By comparing these numbers with those given above of the rimes of the various consonants with each other, we may see how often we should expect certain consonants to rime together; then by a comparison of this latter result with the number of rimes actually found, we can judge which, among the nasals and liquids, were regarded as most similar for rime purposes.

Thus, 77 rimes of *l: n* are expected where 104 actually occur, but where we should expect 45 of *l: r*, and 27 of *l: m*, only 36 and 5 respectively are found.

If this method be carried out for each consonant we arrive

at a result for their similarity which may be represented by the two lines $\left\{ \begin{matrix} l, n, r, m \\ n, l, m, r \end{matrix} \right\}$; that is to say, starting from l in the upper line and proceeding to the right are given, in order of similarity to it, the other consonants; then with m as starting point and advancing to the left, the same is true, and also in the case of n and r in the second line. The results obtained show that l and n are most similar to each other, and r and m , for purposes of rime.

Beside the above consonants there are rimes of other similar consonants which require some discussion, namely $ng(\tilde{n}):n$, and $d:n$.

The following considerations justify us in assuming the existence and intentional character of rime of the guttural nasal and dental nasal in final syllables, as in *biginnan:singan*:

I. Their similarity as nasal consonants.

II. The frequency of rimes of $ng:n$, for of the 109 rimes of ng with other consonants 69, i. e. $64\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the total number, are with n .

III. Excluding the rimes of $ng:n$, the other rimes of ng are with consonants¹ that are similar to n (nasals, liquids, and d) and joined in rime with it frequently. That is to say, $83\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the rimes of ng with other consonants are with n or consonants similar to n , a proportion that, taken in connection with other proof cited above, tends to show that the riming of ng with n in final syllables is intentional.

It may be objected that if rime of ng with n is assumed, we must also admit that of g with n , because of its frequency, as it occurs 65 times to 69 instances of $ng:n$, but a study of the former shows that they are clearly due to chance and are in no way intentional. As proof the following may be adduced:

I. g and n are dissimilar consonants, whereas ng and n are of like nature.

II. The proportion of ng rimes with n is greater than that of $g:n$, for while out of a total of 109 rimes of ng 69 are with n , i. e. 63.3 per cent, of a total of 144 rimes of g only 65, or

¹ The only exceptions are $ng:g=14$ (cf. Refrain in V 19 which contains 5 rimes of *thingon:mennisgon*), $ng:t=1$, and $ng:b=1$.

45.1 per cent are with *n*, so that there is a difference of 18.2 per cent.

III. From a classification of the *g:n* rimes it can be seen that 52 out of the total 65 are such as come under the head of three-syllable or antepenultimate rime, as *ingegini:menigī*; but of the rimes with *ng:n* only 5 are of this character, the remainder belonging to the type *thwinge:inne*. This fact is significant, for in antepenultimate rime there is not only an effort to secure rime of the penult, but also of the antepenult, hence the number of words where this amount of agreement is found must of necessity be more restricted than in penultimate rime, and we therefore find the same rime-pairs repeated again and again, or one word occurring a number of times in different combinations. Thus, *ingegini:menigī* is found 26 times, nearly one-half the total number of rimes of *n:g*; similarly, *menigī:githigini*, 4 times, and *bredigōn:redinōn*, 6 times. Besides, in the effort to rime both penult and antepenult there is less opportunity of making the initial consonant of the final syllable identical or similar; and in a rime in which the first two syllables rime and the initial consonant of the ultima does not, the absence of agreement in the latter would not be felt as keenly as in the case of penultimate rime.

IV. *n* occurs as the initial consonant of the final syllable in antepenultimate rimes 102 times in all, i. e. more often than any other consonant, *g* coming second¹ with 64 instances. It is therefore the most natural state of affairs to find these two consonants riming so often with each other, as it is merely a question of frequency of use. There is accordingly no reason for assuming intention in the numerous rimes of *n:g*.

At this point the question presents itself what was the pronunciation of *ng* as evidenced by Otfrid's rimes? *ng* is found in rime with other consonants a total of 109 times, 70 of which, or 62½ per cent, are rimes with double consonants; that is, there are 60 rimes with *nn*, as *biginnan:singan*, and 10 with *ll*, as *zellen:thingen*. So large a proportion of the rimes of *ng* being with double consonants leads one to the point of view that

¹ *r* occupies third place with 31, and *l* fourth, with 27 rimes, which serves to show the much greater frequency of *n* and *g* in this class of rimes.

ng itself was a geminate, i. e. a single sound as in modern German, but pronounced long and divided between the two syllables as in the case of the Old High German geminates.

Graphically, this may be represented as follows: *bigin-nan: siñ-ñan* (sigan), thus affording a satisfactory explanation for the frequent riming of *ng* with a double consonant.¹

As to the rimes of *n* with *d*, the following considerations will serve to show that they too were regarded by Otfrid as similar, and as such joined in rime:

I. As voiced dental consonants *d* and *n* are similar.

II. They occur frequently in rime together, a total of 65 times.

III. It can be proved that such rimes are intentional. Let us examine, for instance, with the aid of Ingenbleek² the rimes in *-an*, which constitutes one of the most frequent rime endings.

It is found that there are 19 cases of *-dan* in suffix rime, of which 8 are identical rimes (i. e. *-dan: -dan*); thus leaving 11 instances of rime with other consonants. Now, of these 11, 7, or nearly 64 per cent, are rimes of *-dan: -nan*. If we examine the other rimes in *-an*, as for example, those in *-tan*, *-gan*, *-ban*, etc., we find them well represented, and in some cases occurring as often as the *-nan* rimes. Therefore, if the rimes of *-dan: -nan* are merely accidental, and not intentional, we expect to find *-dan* riming as freely, or nearly so, with other consonants as with *-nan*. As a matter of fact, no other consonant appears a reasonable number of times in rime with *-dan* as compared with the rimes of *-nan: -dan*, so we are justified in asserting that *-dan* and *-nan* are intentionally associated.

If, in like manner, we survey the rimes in *-on* we find 30 cases of *-don* in suffix rime, of which 12 are identical, leaving 18 instances of rime with other consonants. Of this number, 10, or about 56 per cent, are rimes of *-don: -non*, so that there

¹ Panzer in Gudrun, p. 20, Note 1, arrives at this same conclusion for the Gudrun, because of the numerous rimes of *nn: ng*. His statement is as follows: "Gem. dent. cons.: gem. gutt. cons. Diese Aussprache muss die Lautgruppe *ng* nach Ausweis eben dieser Reime bereits gehabt haben."

² Reimlexikon zu Otfrid, QuF., XXXVII, 47 f.

remains 8 cases of *-don* in rime with other consonants. Of other rimes in *-on* those in *-ton*, *-ron*, *-gon*, and *-lon* are frequent, and we ask again if chance ruled why should not the proportion of rimes of *-don* with other consonants approach more closely that of *-non*:*-don*? The highest number of rimes of *-don* with any other combination than *-non* is 3, viz., that of *-don*:*-gon*. That is to say, out of the 35 times that *-gon* appears in rime with other consonants only one-twelfth are *-gon*:*-don*. Upon comparing this with the rimes of *-non*:*-don* it will be seen that of the 50 rimes of *-non* with other consonants, 10, or one-fifth, are rimes of *-non*:*don*, showing, therefore, more than twice as large a proportion in the latter case.

The question may be asked, how is it that of 50 rimes of *-non* only 10 are with *-don*, and should we not expect a greater percentage? What are the remaining 40 rimes of *-non*? 26 are rimes of *-non* with other nasals and liquids—10 are with *l*, 10 with *r*, and 6 with *m*—so that the proportion of the *-non*:*-don* rimes is the same as that of the nasals and liquids, which, as we have already shown, Otfrid felt as similar. Hence, we may conclude that *n* and *d* must likewise have been regarded as similar consonants for rime purposes.

It would be possible to go through various other rime endings, such as those in *-es*, *-a*, etc., and we should find that the rimes of *d:n* occur in much larger proportion than those of other consonants with *d*, even though the former were met with often in rime and might, therefore, be expected to occur as frequently as *n* in rime with *d*, or in the proper ratio, were these rimes merely accidental. As this has been shown not to be the case, we may regard the point in question as proved.

In about nine-tenths of these rimes of *d:n* there is also rime of the penult. Cf. *blide:sīne*, and Koegel,¹ in classifying such rimes states under his fourth division: "Der Vokal der vorhergehenden (i. e. penultimate) Silbe wird hereingezogen, zunächst ohne Berücksichtigung der zwischenstehenden Consonanz." The above discussion of the rimes of our entire second class has shown this point of view to be incorrect, and serves to confirm Paul's opinion,² which is as follows:

¹ Deutsche Litteraturgeschichte I, 2, 23 f.

² PGr.² II. 2, 109.

"Sobald übrigens diese Konsonanten (i. e. initial consonants of the final syllables) einander wenigstens ähnlich sind, tragen sie doch zu schärferem Hervortreten des Reimes bei, und es zeigt sich daher auch, dass diese Aehnlichkeit in den meisten Fällen vorhanden ist, also erstrebt sein muss."

As regards our third class, in which the initial consonant of the final syllable is neither identical nor similar, as in such rimes as *hōhi:dāti*, *bredigu:redinu*, no special comment is called for. In passing we may note that it is the smallest of our three divisions, being represented by only 398 rimes, another evidence of Otfrid's careful regard for the ultimate syllable.

PENULTIMATE RIME

Up to this point we have examined mainly the final syllable; we are now ready for a consideration of rime extending over two syllables, that is penultimate rime.

Accurate rimes of the above class, such as *henti:enti* are found in extensive use in Otfrid, and may be divided according to accent¹ into the following categories:

I. Both words have primary accent on the penultimate syllable. This comprises the rime of stem with stem.¹ Cf. *frōnd:scōnd* = 1631

II. One penult has primary, the other secondary accent.

(a) Stem: stem, one word being compound. Cf. *wūnni:adal-kūnni* = 233

(β) Stem: suffix syllable. Cf. *minnā:drūtinnā* = 117

III. Both penults have secondary accent.

(a) Compound: compound. Cf. *ūmbi-thèrbì:adal-èrbì* = 6

(β) Compound: suffix syllable. Cf. *éban-reitì:árabeitì* = 5

Total, 1992

¹ Cf. for accent of words in rime position: PGr., 2, 919; Sievers, PBBtr., 4, 525 f.; 13, 121 f.; Wilmanns, ZfdA., 16, 117 f.; 27, 105 f.; Beiträge zur älteren deutschen Litteratur, Heft 3, pp. 1-129; Trautmann, Lachmann's Betonungsgesetze und Otfrid's Vers, Halle, 1877; Behaghel, Gesch. d. deu. Sprache, p. 689.

² For such rimes as *ságeti:hábeti* compare Antepenultimate Rime.

Combining the examples found in these three divisions, there is a total of 1992 instances, or 27.7 per cent of Otfrid's rimes are to be classed under the rubric of accurate penultimate rime, very little less than the rime of root syllables with each other, this being 29.2 per cent.

Considering suffix rime alone, accurate penultimate rime forms about 39 per cent thereof, and as Books I and V contain the greatest amount of the former, there is more chance for accurate penultimate rime in them than in the remaining books; we should, therefore, expect them to show a larger percentage than that found elsewhere. In the table given below the third and fourth lines represent the amount of suffix rime included under accurate penultimate rime.

	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
Suffix rime	971	861	1084	1109	1066	= 5091
	78.2%	69.2%	68.8%	70.6%	72.4%	= 71.7%
Acc. pen. rime	332	347	432	418	463	= 1992
	34.3%	40.2%	39.8%	37.7%	43.4%	= 39%

The above tabulation shows that I contains 5.8 per cent more suffix rime than any of the other books; it should, therefore, comprise more accurate penultimate rime, but our enumeration above shows that it includes even less, by 3.4 per cent, than any other book, whereas V shows approximately the expected proportion. It will be necessary to note, in the succeeding categories, any increase above the normal ratio on the part of I, in order to see in what class or classes of rimes its greater percentage makes its appearance.

At this point we may consider the question of rime on the part of the inseparable prefixes *gi*, *bi*, and *ir*, as in *gidāti*: *girāti*, *birīnit*: *biscīnit*, *irwellen*: *irzellen*. Grimm¹ speaks of these under the heading of "Erweiterter Reim" as follows:

"Häufig reimen unter sich die zu einem Endreim gehörigen untrennbaren Partikeln: da sie aber niemals betont, vielmehr wenn sie zur Senkung an dieser Silbe nicht dienen, ganz verschluckt werden, so kann man nur eine leichte Zuthat zu dem Reim darin erblicken."

¹ Kleinere Schriften 4, 214 f.

He believes, therefore, that such prefixes, when found together, serve as a slight addition to the rime, and that their agreement was aimed at.

Paul¹ denies all such intention, holding this agreement to be merely accidental, and of little importance. This latter is probably the correct view as far as the prefixes *ir* and *bi* are concerned, for as such rimes as *birīnit*: *biscīnit*, *irzellen*: *irzellen*, occur only 8 or 10 times in each case in the entire poem, the probability that the identity is merely accidental is so great that no intention can be asserted, especially as both prefixes occur frequently in rime in other combinations. With the prefix *gi*, however, we have a different state of affairs:

I. Rimes like *girāti*: *gidāti* are numerous, there being a total² of 96.

II. The type of *gi*:- *gi*- appears in all three types of rimes, whether it be (a) root syllable rime, as *gisah*: *gimah*, (b) penultimate rime, as *ginuagi*: *giwagi*, or (c) antepenultimate, as *githrewita*: *gistrewita*; whereas, the few identical rimes of *bi* and *ir* are all found in penultimate rime.

III. From a consideration of some of the rimes in which *gi* figures it would seem as though Otfrid consciously chose in the one case a form in *gi* when another form without it was at hand and would have apparently served the purpose as well.

Let us look, for instance, at the rime *gisah*: *gimah* which appears 9 times (I 8. 2; I 9. 32; II 6. 49; 9. 59; III 20. 28; 104; 147; V 8. 19; 12. 46).

The form of *gimah* must remain invariable, but instead of *gisah* the simple form *sah* might have been used without substantially changing the meaning of the line. That *sah*: *gimah* never occurs seems to point to the fact that the poet employed the compound verb in order to effect rime of the prefix in addition to that of the root syllable.

Likewise, the adverbial phrase in *girihtī*, which appears 12 times in rime, stands in 5 cases rimed with forms in *gi*. Three

¹ PGr.² II, 2, 109.

² The rime of past part.: past part. is excluded from consideration, as *gi* would naturally occur here in both words, and fall under the head of rime-parallelism. Cf. Vos, Rime-parallelism in O. H. G. verse, Studies in honor of B. L. Gildersleeve, Baltimore, 1901.

of these are with *gisih̄ti* (III 26. 58; IV 1. 54; V 23. 177), one with *gikuih̄ti* (IV 8. 22), and one with the verb *gisliht̄i* (IV 4. 34), of which the uncompounded form does not occur in Otfrid. There is also a phrase *in riht̄i* which, as Piper¹ justly observes, has precisely the meaning of *in giriht̄i*, i. e. "straight-way," and if the correspondence of the *gi* forms is not aimed at, why do we not have this *in riht̄i* riming with the above words instead of *in giriht̄i*?

The adjective *ginuagi*, in one or the other of its inflectional forms appears 3 times in rime with the verb *gifuagen*. The latter has an uncompounded form *fuagen* of like meaning, which is rejected here seemingly to bring the agreement of the prefixes into play. These 3 rimes are found in III 14. 71; V 12. 68; V 25. 90.

So, too, in case of the rime *ginuagi: gifiangi* (III 16. 74), there exists the simple form of the verb *fiani*, but again we have the compound form apparently for the reason above given.²

The adjective *ginuag* appears in rime 10 times; 8 of these are with *giwuag* (pret. sg. of *giwahan*). Here, too, the agreement seems to be sought for, in addition to the rime of the accented syllable, for although the number of rimes in *-uag* is only 38, still the percentage of rimes of *ginuag* with *giwuag* is greater than one would expect, even though they are the two most frequent rime words of the above ending.³

Whenever, therefore, we find both riming words of a couplet compounded with the prefix *gi-*, we are justified in assuming that its presence is intentional,⁴ and that it serves as a slight addition to the rime of the accented syllable or syllables.

¹ Otfrid's Evangelienbuch, II. Theil, Glossar und Abriss der Grammatik.

² The majority of the rimes of this type are of verbs, such as *gihaltan: giwaltan*, that exist in both simple and compound form, or both rime words are such as have only the *gi* forms, as *giwurt: giburt*, in which case nothing can be proved from them.

³ The statistic is as follows: Total number of rimes in *-uag* = 38; *ginuag* = 10; *giwuag* = 16; other words in *-uag* = 12.

⁴ From an examination of the verbs and passages in question it does not appear that the use of the *gi-* is in these cases due to any special perfective function.

This conclusion would seem to indicate that Otfrid's attitude was: the more agreement, the more rime, and this will have to be borne in mind in the discussion that is to follow.

Turning now to the consideration of inaccurate penultimate rime we may make 3 main divisions:

I. The vowels or diphthongs of the penult are identical, but there is some consonantal inaccuracy. Cf. *guatun: stuantun*, *waltan: stantan*.

II. The penultimate vowels or diphthongs are not wholly identical, but contain some element of identity, with occasionally an inaccuracy in the consonant. Cf. *guate: drūte*; *liuti: riati*; *thurfti: ruafti*.

III. The penultimate vowels or diphthongs are different. Cf. *harto: wortō*; *wuntar: altar*; *zīti: nōti*.

Class I may be divided into the following two subdivisions:

A. One penult ends in a consonant, the other in a vowel or diphthong.

B. The penults end in consonants that are not identical, but are either (a) similar, or (b) dissimilar.

As examples under A may be cited such rimes as *riatun: giziartun*; *gimeinti: chuanheiti*; *guatun: stuantun*. This is not a large category; it contains 97 rimes, which occur in the various books as follows:

I	II	III	IV	V	Total
16	23	19	22	17	97
1.6%	2.7%	1.8%	1.9%	1.5%	1.9%

As the above percentages show, the ratio between the books is not far from normal, though I and V should show a higher percentage—particularly the former—as they contain the largest amount of suffix rime.

The most noteworthy feature of this class of rimes is that in two-thirds of them the extra consonant is either a nasal or liquid, *r* and *n* being especially common, the former occurring 26, the latter 22 times.¹ The reason for this predominance of nasal and liquid is to be sought in the fact that they, as the

¹ The others are *l*, 12; *m*, 1; of consonants that are not nasals or liquids are found: *t*, 7; *h*, 6; and others occurring only once each.

most sonorous consonants, would blend with, and offer least hindrance to, the rime of the vowels. This consideration seems to have influenced Otfrid in his selection of rime words, for there is a tendency to restrict these latter to certain rime groups where the consonants in question appear. Cf. *hōrti: nōti* (II 5. 19; III 17. 30; IV 13. 52; IV 24. 2); *gihōrta: wernōta* (III 20. 169), and *hōrtun:redinōtun* (III 12. 9); *guati: stuanti* (II 2. 10; III 13. 58; 15. 21; IV 15. 56; IV 30. 12; 36. 13); *bita: iltā* (III 24. 40; V 7. 56. 65), and *bitun: iltun* (V 4. 10; 5. 4); *ilti: sīti* (I 22. 2; V 4. 11; 16. 7); *fuarta: guata* (I 15. 11; II 4. 51). Other instances might be given: they would all serve to show an effort to secure a sonorous consonant for the one penult, as least disturbing the vocalic agreement or rime.

Other rimes that may also be mentioned here are those in which the initial consonants of the penults are identical. In a subsequent discussion the attempt will be made to show that this identity was sought for, as an additional element of rime in the penultimate syllable. Those to be classed under I A are: *mīnu: urminnu* (I 4. 50); *abahōtun: gihōrtun* (III 19. 19; 24. 110); *gieiscōta: scolta* (IV 3. 20); *bibinōta: nōtta* (IV 34. 1).

Subdivision B of Class I consists of such rimes as *waltan: stantan*; *thulti: wurti*; *leitta: irdeilta*, etc. It exceeds the preceding class in frequency, comprising a total of 158 rimes, which are divided as follows, under the groups (a) and (b), as mentioned on page 22:

I	II	III	IV	V	Total
(a) 24	20	35	28	22	= 129
(b) 10	8	2	5	4	= 29
Total 34	28	37	33	26	= 158
3.4%	3.1%	3.4%	3%	2.4%	= 3.1%

Book I approaches here more closely to the percentage we should expect from the amount of its suffix rime, than in A, but V, contrary to our expectations, shows the fewest instances of all.

Another peculiarity of this class consists in the frequency with which the penult ends in a nasal or liquid. All the rimes of subdivision (a) come under this head and in only 29 rimes,

therefore, of the entire 158 are consonants other than these used, 10 of these being found in Book I. In such rimes as *wartēn:haltēn* we may accordingly assume intention to rime not only the penultimate vowels but also the consonants, in this case *r* and *l*, ending this syllable. That is to say, we have a state of things similar to that already discussed in the rime of final syllables. In the latter case, when not identical, the initial consonants of these syllables are usually similar, the riming of nasals and liquids with one another, as in *scōni:wāri*, being very frequent. In the present instance, when we do not get an accurate penultimate rime, such as *henti:enti*, there is an effort to introduce such rimes as *wartēn:haltēn*, where the penultimate consonants are similar and where their sonorous quality actually becomes a feature of the rime, instead of hindering it as other voiceless dissimilar consonants would do. Rimes of *l:n* are especially numerous, appearing 63 times; *l:r* shows 37 instances. No rime of *l:m* is found in this class; the others¹ are: *n:r*, 18; *n:m*, 10; *r:m*, 2. The order of frequency of these consonants in rime is: *l*, 100 times; *n*, 91; *r*, 57; *m*, 12. Here the condition of affairs is very similar to the statistic given under the *Ultima*.² That is to say, *l* and *n* seem to be regarded as most similar, *l* and *r* next, and *l* and *m* least similar of all. The only difference in the present case is that 10 of the 12 rimes of *m* are with *n* where we should expect, proportional to the total number of *n* rimes, only 6. This, therefore, points to *m* and *n* as the most similar of all the nasals and liquids; whereas, in the class referred to above, the statistic showed *m* and *r* to be the most common combination, *m* and *n*, however, being a very close second.

In this division we may also observe the tendency toward riming certain words together so often that they may, in so far as the stem of the word is concerned, be said to form typical rime pairs. As examples of such typical rimes of *l:n* the following may be mentioned:

1. Some inflectional form of *gimeinen*: some form of *deilen* (vb.): *gimeinta: (ir)deilta* (II 1. 33; III 6. 41; IV 7. 71; 19.

¹ To these must, of course, be added the 29 referred to on p. 23.

² P. 14.

69); *gimeintun:irdeiltun* (IV 6. 15); *gimeintī:irdeiltī* (II 12. 78); *gimeintīn:gideiltīn* (IV 28. 4). Other rimes from these same stems, which may be noticed here, although they do not belong to this class, as the penult does not end in a consonant, are: *gimeine* (vb.): *deile* (II 13. 32; V 20. 64); *gimeinit:irdeilit* (II 9. 20; III 18. 20; II 12. 84); *gimeini* (adj.): *urdeili* (noun.) (III 16. 46; V 20. 2). These rimes are mentioned in passing in order to show that it is not merely inflectional forms that Otfrid associates, but the words themselves.

2. Some form of *gimeinen*: some form of *heilen*—*gimeinta:heilta* (II 24. 9; III 4. 37; 14. 54; 16. 34; IV 2. 1. 26; 12. 15); *gimeintī:heilī* (III 2. 6; 3. 6; 11. 6. 12).¹

3. *giwelti:henti* (I 7. 13; 16. 28; II 4. 85; 13. 30; IV 11. 8).

4. *giwelti:enti* (I 15. 37; 28. 6; V 6. 60. 63; 25. 20. 102).

5. *zalta:irkanta* (I 13. 23; II 7. 62. 69; 12. 11), and others.

Examples of *n:r* are not so numerous, though there are a number occurring twice. Cf. also *wurtun:bifuntun* (I 8. 5; V 6. 26; 23. 281).

For *n:m* cf. *stimna:minna* (I 9. 11; III 22. 22; IV 33. 16; V 12. 57), and *minnu:stimnu* (III 13. 12; IV 21. 34; V 12. 94; 20. 66).

For *l:r* cf. 1. *thulti:antwurti* (III 17. 38; 18. 37; 22. 35; IV 19. 41; 23. 34; V 20. 81), and *thulti:wurti* (III 19. 25; IV 10. 4; 15. 44).

2. Some form of *helfan*: some form of *werfan*²—*werfet:gihelfet* (II 11. 33); *hilfit:firwirfit* (II 17. 8); *gihulfīn:wurfīn* (III 18. 70); *gihelfe:firwerfe* (III 4. 24; 17. 16).

3. Some form of *wartēn*: some form of *haltan*—*wartēn:haltēn* (I 29. 9; II 4. 59); *wartēs:haltēs* (I 19. 12); *giwartent:gihaltent* (II 19. 10).

4. *harto:managfalto* (IV 9. 29. 32; 26. 25).

While this does not by any means exhaust the list of rime groups, the above will be sufficient to show to how large an extent they occur, and the explanation of their frequency is at hand; namely, that these rimes between nasals and liquids were

¹ Similarly 5 rimes of *gimeini* (adj.): *heili* (noun).

² The rimes of *helfan:werfan* afford an interesting illustration of how Otfrid associates the words themselves together and not merely inflectional forms.

regarded as good, and that two words of this sort having once been used together one was likely to call forth the other whenever afterwards employed.

There are 7 rimes belonging under this category, that have the initial consonant identical, and they may be noted here, to bear witness later on to the fact that this identity was sought for. They are: *gikundti: kunfti* (I 23. 6; IV 18. 34); *gihclfe: irheffe* (II 17. 17); *werke: irwelke* (III 7. 67); *eiscōnti: scolti* (III 15. 38); *giliubta: inliuhta* (III 20. 146); *intfuarta: fualta* (IV 31. 34).

This completes the discussion of our first main class and brings us to Class II, in which the penultimate vowel or diphthong is not identical, but contains some element of identity, with occasionally a consonantal inaccuracy. For convenience we may further separate this class into two divisions:

1. The vowel of one penult rimes with one element of the diphthong of the other penult.

a. With the first element of the diphthong, cf.

liuti: ziti = 30

β. With the second element of the diphthong, cf.

wāra: fiara = 122

The riming of the vowel is, in over two-thirds of the cases, with the second part of the diphthong.¹

2. One element of one diphthong rimes with one element of the other diphthong.

a. The first element rimes with the first element.

Cf. *liuti: riati* = 19

β. The first element rimes with the second element. Cf. *liuti: gimuati* = 32

γ. The second element rimes with the second element. Cf. *fiarta: ruarta* = 29

—
Total, 80

¹ There is nothing surprising, however, in this, for over half the rimes under β, i. e. 89, are of *ā: ua* (60) or *ā: ia* (29). As *a* is the "hellste Vokal" in German it is much better adapted to carrying the rime than either the *u* or *i* in the above diphthongs; so that although the stress of voice is upon the first element of the diphthong, yet the second element is intrinsically the more suitable for purposes of rime.

As the diphthongs in Old High German are falling diphthongs we should expect, as a rule, to find the first, or most strongly stressed, parts of the diphthongs riming together, but from a glance at the above it may be seen that this is the smallest of the three divisions.

The reason for the so frequent appearance of sub-class γ at least will be clear when one considers that 19 of its 29 rimes are of *ua:ia*, that is, rimes in which the second components of the diphthongs can more easily carry the rime, they being more sonorous than the first elements.

It would appear,¹ therefore, from categories *a* and γ that sonority of the vowel is of more importance in the rime of diphthongs than mere stress, but it is a more difficult task to explain why β should be the most numerously represented of all three categories.

A consideration of two points, however, will serve to show that rime of the penult was undoubtedly intended, not only in regard to sub-class β , but in all examples included under our main division II:

A. In addition to the vocalic agreements, the initial consonant of the penult is sometimes identical. These cases are: Under 1: *lībe:liebe* (IV 37. 14; V 20. 45; 23. 55; 188); *lībe:liabe* (III 14. 8; V 20. 39); *lībes:liobes* (I 16. 20); *wīson:weison* (I 18. 24; IV 15. 47); *lūto:liuto* (IV 24. 13; IV 26. 5); *lūti:liuti* (IV 33. 22); *wāri:fiħurwiari* (III 4. 3); *sāzi:suazi* (IV 4. 16; 5. 30); *gīfartīn:fuartīn* (IV 35. 25); *gīmuati:mammunti* (V 23. 214).

Under 2: *inliuhte:liahte* (I 12. 4); *liobo:giloubo* (III 23. 8; IV 13. 28); *leibta:liubta* (V 11. 43); *liubi:giloubi* (V 7. 4; 20. 44); *giliuben:gilouben* (I 26. 11; III 26. 12); *liuti:giloubti* (II 2. 9); *liuti:brūtloufti* (III 8. 3).

B. We have again certain rime groups which would hardly continue to appear with such regularity were the rime not intended and felt in these cases as, at least, permissible. Only a few will be cited. Under 1 are: *wāri* (adj. or vb.): *(gi)fuari* (noun or vb.), 5; *wāra* (adj.): *fuara* (noun), 5; *wāru:fuaru*, 1; *wārīn* (vb.): *fuārīn* (vb.), 2; *wārun* (vb.): *fuarun* (vb.), 5;

¹ Cf. also 1 β and note.

guati: *dāti*, 15; *liuti* or some inflectional form thereof: *zīti* or some form thereof, 5; *hiare*: *thāre*, 3; *firliazi*: *sāzi*, 3.

Of those under 2 may be mentioned, according to frequency: *gifiarta*: *ruarta*, 6; *liuti*: *gimuati*, 4; *hiuti*: *guati*, 4; *lībe*: *liebe*, 4; *loufti*: *anaruofti*, 3, and others.

In order to give a clear idea as to how the rimes of the sub-classes I and 2 are divided in the various books, a statistic of the main class II is appended:

	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
(1) Vowel: elem. of diph.	21	17	36	39	26	139
(2) Elem. of diph.: elem. of diph.	12	10	16	18	12	68
Extra consonant in one penult.	{ 1. 3 2. 0	2	3	2	3	} 25
		5	3	4	0	
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	36	34	58	63	41	232
	3.6%	3.8%	5.2%	5.4%	3.7%	4.4%

Here, too, we do not get the larger percentage in Books I and V to be expected from the larger amount of their suffix rime, but even a somewhat less frequent use than elsewhere.

In stating this second main class,¹ mention was made of an occasional consonantal inaccuracy appearing in the penult. As seen from the enumeration above, this inaccuracy takes the form of an extra consonant² in one penult, as in *gimuagi*: *giangi*, *gimuati*: *mammunti*, etc., and plays only a minor rôle, appearing in not quite one-ninth of the total number of examples. Of these 25 instances, the extra consonant is a nasal or liquid in four-fifths of the cases, thus again demonstrating the preference for these.

We have now reached our third main category, in which the penultimate vowels of the rime words are dissimilar. The first question that presents itself is whether rime vowels may be dissimilar, and yet the rime of the penults be maintained. Three subdivisions of this class may be distinguished:

1. The penult ends in a vowel or diphthong.

A. The initial consonants of the penults are identical; cf. *dōti*: *gidāti*.

¹ P. 22.

² Most frequently $r=8$, or $n=8$; $l=4$; no case of m .

B. The initial consonants of the penults are not identical;
cf. *dāti*:*nōti*.

2. One penult ends in a vowel or diphthong; the other in a consonant. Cf. *guati*:*hōrti*.

3. The penults end in consonants, which may be

(a) identical—

1. The initial consonants of the penult are identical;
cf. *minno*:*manno*.

2. The initial consonants of the penult are not identical;
cf. *harto*:*worto*.

(β) Not identical, but

1. Similar.

A. The initial consonants of the penult are identical;
cf. *giborge*:*belge*.

B. The initial consonants of the penult are not identical;
cf. *wuntar*:*altar*; or

2. Dissimilar;¹ cf. *kundti*:*mahti*.

In discussing the above question it seems advisable to start with sub-class 3, as clearer and more satisfactory results can thus be arrived at.

Let us consider first, then, 3a, where the final consonants of the penultimate syllables are identical. The following 5 considerations serve to show that we are justified in assuming intentional rime in these combinations:

I. The rimes occur frequently, 662 times in all, and form about 13 per cent of the total amount of suffix rime. The examples are distributed as follows over the various books:

Types.	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
<i>minno</i> : <i>manno</i> .	16	9	14	18	9	66
<i>harto</i> : <i>worto</i> .	95	120	127	132	122	596
	III	129	141	150	131	662
Propor. of suffix rime.	11.4%	15%	13.1%	13.7%	12.4%	13%

Book V and, more especially, I again fall short, as in all other

¹ The division into A and B is not necessary here as there is only one example where the initial consonants of the penults are identical—*gisihti*:*wahsenti* (I 23. 44).

classes thus far treated, of the amount we should expect in view of their larger percentage of suffix rime.

II. There is a marked tendency to end the penult as a nasal or liquid, i. e. a sonorous consonant. The proportion of rimes in which this is the case to that in which it is not is 459:203, showing how favored the nasals and liquids were.¹ *l* and *r* are most frequent, the former occurring 186, the latter 158 times; *n* is found in 114 rimes, but strange to say no rimes of *m* are present in this entire subdivision.

However, as has been noted in the previous classes, *m* is much less frequently used than the other nasals and liquids. As has already been suggested, Otfrid seems to operate upon the principle that the more sonority there is in a syllable the greater will be the rime effect produced. This principle has already been illustrated² by such rimes as *nōti:hōrti*.

Again, in the rime of a vowel with a diphthong,³ as in *dāti:guati*, notwithstanding the heavier stress of the first element of the diphthong, in the majority of these rimes the vowel rimes with the second element, it being in most cases the more sonorous part. Such rimes as *lūti:guati*, i. e. with the first element, are rare.

III. In addition to the final consonant of the penult, its initial consonant is often identical, thus heightening the rime effect. Cf. *minno:manno*. The number of instances coming under this subdivision is 66, in all of which this identity must be regarded as striven for, as an increase to the rime of the penult: (1) Because this same feature has already been noted in other categories of rimes; and will also be pointed out in classes not yet discussed. To mention by way of anticipation one other class outside of penultimate rime where this identity is found, there is, in antepenultimate rime, a type *obana:thanana*, occurring 42 times, and belonging to the same category but with the initial consonant identical are such rimes as *thanana:thegana*, 16 instances, of which the latter rime constitutes 12. In *obana:thanana* there is really no agreement of the antepen-

¹ Of the non-sonorous consonants there are 85 cases of rimes in *s* and 72 in *h*.

² P. 23.

³ P. 26 and note.

nult, whereas in *thanana: thegana* this syllable is brought into rime by means of its identical initial consonant. The proportion of the latter to the former class, constituting as it does two-ninths of the total, is too great to admit of the identity being explained as due to accident; it is, therefore, to be regarded as a conscious effort to bring the antepenult into rime. In the *minno: manno* type rime may be already affirmed on the basis of the identical final consonant of the penult, and we may, therefore, go a step further and assume intentional correspondence of initial consonant, a feature that we have already seen playing a part in the rime of the prefixes *gi: gi*.

The ratio of the *minno: manno* to the *harto: worto* rimes is about 1:9, which, with the evidence above given, is sufficiently high to prove the point.

(2) Because there is a marked tendency to use these rimes in groups, showing that the rime was pleasing enough to bear repetition again and again. Cf. *minno: manno*, 1; *minnōn: mannon*, 9; *worton: ēwartōn*, 9; *worte: ēwarte*, 1; *worto: widarwerto*, 2; *worton: widarwertōn*, 2; *rehte: rihte*, 3; *worte: antwurte*, 3; *lante: elilente*, 3; *lante: ilente*, 1; *wolti: giwelti*, 2; *irwolli: irwelli*, 1; *wollent: wellent*, 1; *wollet: wellet*, 1; others might be quoted, occurring once or twice and showing the same identity as in the above rimes.

IV. The rimes of both the *worto: harto* and *minnon: mannon* types must have been in good standing because, as already shown above, in a part of this class, i. e. the *minno: manno* rimes, they are found so often in rime groups that intention may be assumed. A few of the *worto: harto* type are *harto: worto*, 67; *druhtin: mahtin*,¹ 27; *wizzi: nuzzi*, 10; *follon: wil- lon*, 22; *willen* (noun): *fullen* (vb.), 16; *festi: brusti*, 10; *alle: folle*, 9; *nahtes: rehtes*, 5; *fristi: festi*, 6; *thanne: zellenne*, 3; *thanne: thārinne*, 3; *herton: worton*, 5.

Grimm² places the rimes of the *minno: manno* type under the rubric of identical rime; but at the beginning of his study he has defined *rührender reim* as follows: "Rührender Reim setzt völlige Gleichheit aller Buchstaben voraus." It appears,

¹ Cf. Refrain V 23.

² Kleinere Schriften 4, 160.

therefore, that he has departed from his definition with regard to these rimes. Paul's designation (*Grundriss*,² p. 110) of this type as "rührender ungenauer Reim" contains a clear *contradictio in adjecto*. The above discussion has presented these combinations in a different light, and has served to show that they are not to be regarded as identical rime¹ but should be classified as inaccurate penultimate rime, exhibiting a somewhat more advanced stage than the *harto:warto* type, but being of the same general nature; that also this identity was conscious, forming part of a plan to secure as much agreement in the riming syllables as possible.

It may be objected that, if this latter observation be true, Otfrid's conception of the most accurate rime would be identical rime. While such a statement would not be warranted, yet Otfrid cannot be said to manifest a marked tendency towards avoidance of identical rime, as $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the entire body of his rimes consists of such.

The usage of the other rimed poems of the Old High German period also corresponds rather closely to that of Otfrid.²

V. It can be shown in the majority of cases that the vowels of the penults themselves, though not identical, are not arranged at haphazard with reference to each other, but that there is a tendency to rime the vowels most closely related with one another, thus bringing both consonant and vowel into rime.

As is well known,³ *a* as 'reiner Vokal' is the most sonorous of all the vowels, while *u* and *i* are the least sonorous. As middle stages respectively between *a* and *i* and between *a* and *u* lie *e* and *o*. If, then, we examine the riming penultimate vowels of 3*a* with these facts in mind, what conclusions can be reached in regard to the riming vowels?

First, as to the vowel *a*, 152 of the 344 instances are rimes with *o*. That is to say, nearly one-half of the total number of rimes of *a*, the vowel occurring most frequently, are with *o*, and about a fourth of the 662 rimes of which this class is composed are rimes between these two vowels. Both mid-back

¹ Cf. Identical Rime.

² Cf. under Identical Rime, p. 61.

³ Cf. Sievers' *Phonetik*, p. 78.

vowels, the one unrounded and the other rounded, they are the two most similar and sonorous of the vowels, and their frequency in rime together is thus fully explained, and must be regarded as intentional. That this conjunction of *a* and *o* is not due to mere chance may be further enforced by the consideration that proportionally to the total number of occurrences of *a* we should expect rimes with *o* only 65 times; whereas, as stated, these actually number 152.

This same effort can be demonstrated in the case of other vowels that are similar, though perhaps not so clearly and forcibly as in the above collocation. Thus, *a:e* occurs 79 times, this being, after *a:o*, the most frequent rime of *a*, while as regards *e* the latter vowel is found joined in rime with it most frequently of all. Though the similarity is not as great as in the former case, still it may be considered as sufficient. Furthermore, *e* is third in order of sonority, the sequence being represented by *a-o-e* $\begin{Bmatrix} i \\ u \end{Bmatrix}$. So that it would seem that in this instance, also, the riming of *a:e* is to be explained on the same score.

Sixty-three rimes of *e:i* are found, and 79 of *i:u*. The former class does not call for any special comment; in regard to the latter it is noteworthy that in 47 instances, i. e. over half of them, the consonant immediately preceding the *i* is *w*. Cf. *irwintan:gibuntan*, *fulle:wille*. The tendency of the *w* is to produce the effect of a rounding of the *i*, a sound similar enough to *u* to be used in rime with it.

In the vowels riming together most extensively we may, therefore, see a similarity, and in proportion as this likeness decreases there is a corresponding decrease in the number of times that such vowels are joined together in rime. Thus, *a:i*, 46; *e:o*, 40; *i:o*, 33, all of which figures are less than we should expect in proportion to the total number of times that the vowels concerned appear in rime. On the other hand, similar vowels rime together usually about twice as often as the proportion to their total number of occurrences would lead us to expect.

If this investigation of penultimate vowels should be extended so as to include all classes of penultimate rime where

the vowel is not identical, the above results would remain substantially the same. The vowel combinations occurring most frequently are: *a: o*, *a: e*, *e: i*, and *i: u*. In the case of the last mentioned the numerous instances may again in great part be explained as due to a similarity between them, produced by the presence of a *w* preceding the *i* vowel. Furthermore, there are in most cases twice as many of these rimes as would be found if they were due to accident and distributed proportionally. Contrariwise, the more unlike vowels occur less often together than can be justified or explained on any other score than that of conscious avoidance.

Let us next take up the sub-class β of the above¹ division 3, in which the consonant ending the penult is not identical but either (1) similar, or (2) dissimilar.

Nearly the same proofs may be applied here, in support of penultimate rime, as in sub-class α .

I. Though not constituting as large a class as the former, these rimes are not infrequent. Altogether 169 examples occur, distributed as follows:

Types.		I	II	III	IV	V	Total
1.	<i>borge: belge.</i>	1	6	2	2	1	12
	<i>wuntar: altar.</i>	28	29	34	31	24	146
2.	<i>kundti: mahti.</i>	6	2	0	3	0	11
		—	—	—	—	—	—
		35	37	36	36	25	169
		3.6%	4.3%	3.3%	3.2%	2.3%	3.3%

It should be noted that 6 of the 11 rimes in which the consonants ending the penults are dissimilar are in Book I. The percentage of this book is slightly higher for the entire class than that in any other book except II, but in neither I nor V do we find as large a proportion as would be expected in view of the extent of their suffix rime.

II. The penult syllable ends regularly in a nasal or liquid, i. e. a sonorous consonant. Only 11 instances of other consonants are found. The rime of *r: n* is quite common, occurring 92 times; less frequent is *l: r* (36 times), and *l: n* (22 times). The rime of *m* is rare, occurring in only 4 cases,

¹ Cf. p. 29.

which agrees with previous statements in other classes as to its infrequency.

III. In addition to the similarity of the final consonant the initial consonant of the penult is at times identical. This identity, as already demonstrated, was striven for. The instances are: *werkōn:biwankōn* (II 4. 88; 23. 11); *antwurten:wenten* (IV 7. 22; 9. 5); *milti:mammunti* (II 16. 5; III 14. 111; 19. 12); *wurtun:woltun* (V 24. 9); *giborge:belge* (II 18. 15); *giberge:ābulge* (I 23. 40); *widarwinnōn:warnōn* (II 3. 56); *funtan:einfaltan* (II 7. 55); *gisihti:wahsenti* (I 23. 44).

IV. Notwithstanding the small size of the class, rime-groups are present, showing that such a rime as *wuntar:altar* was acceptable. Cf. *manno:gerno*, 9; *milti:antwurti*, 8; a form of *findan*: a form of *werdan*, 6; a form of *thenken*: a form of *wirken*, 15; a form of *githanko* (noun): a form of *werko* (noun), 13; *managfalto:worto*, 4, and others of less frequent occurrence.

V. The tendency to rime the most similar and sonorous vowels may again be observed. The rime of *i* and *u* also is frequent, but it should be noted that in 12 out of a total of 18 rimes, *i* is again preceded by *w*.

The above considerations serve to show that in class β we have penultimate rime, consisting in the rime of similar final consonants and like vowels, with at times the additional agreement of the initial consonant of the penult.

We are now prepared to take up classes 1 and 2 of the same main category. These two are best treated together as 2 constitutes so small a class. The statistics are:

	Types.	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
1.	<i>dōti:gidāti.</i>	2	0	2	2	5	11
	<i>dāti:nōti.</i>	43	43	74	92	76	328
2.	<i>gisītin:wurtin.</i>	15	5	10	10	6	46
		—	—	—	—	—	—
		60	48	86	104	87	385
		6.1%	5.6%	7.9%	9.4%	8.2%	7.5%

As shown above, there is a redundant consonant in one penult in 46 instances. Cf. *guatī:hōrtī*; *dāti:hōnti*. These

latter do not interfere with the penultimate rime because in all except 8 cases these consonants are nasals or liquids, and are, therefore, sonorous elements. Of these, *n* and *r* are most numerous, the former occurring 18, the latter 17 times. Only three instances of *l* are found and none of *m*.

There is, then, a tolerably frequent appearance of rime of this *nōti: dāti* class, Book V containing its approximate proportion, but Book I being still found wanting.

The tendency to group the rimes around certain words is very marked, as in other classes. Thus, there occur: *nōti: dāti* 19; a form of *nōt*: a form of *liut*, 14; *nōti: zīti*, 16; *nōti: muati*, 12; *nōti: guatī*, 12; *ginōto: thrāto*, 8; *nōti: arabeiti*, 5; *wāra: lēra*, 7; *wāra: mēra*, 18; a form of *wār*: a form of *diuri*, 6; *dāti: liuti*, 12; *gidātun* (vb.): *rietun* (vb.), 7; *dāti: zīti*, 3; *guato: arabeito*, 7 (cf. V 23); *guatī: hērōti*, 3; *guate: gibiete* (vb.), 3, and others.

The initial consonant of the penult is sometimes identical, though less frequently than in the classes already discussed. The rimes are: *dōti: gidāti* (V 7. 41); *dōtun: indātun* (V 34. 3); *girāti: hērōti* (III 25. 21); *māru: armēru* (I 7. 10); *ungimezēn: gimazen* (V 10. 24); *māron: mērōn* (III 7. 86); *sāre: sēre* (IV 34. 19); *scōnaz: scīnaz* (I 17. 19); *liebe: giloube* (V 23. 211); *suntilōsan: firliasan* (IV 26. 22); *ginomanan: mīnan* (V 7. 29).

A glance at the above rime groups shows how numerous the rimes are of *nōt* in its inflectional forms with forms of *dāt*, *liut*, *zīt*, etc., as also the rimes between *wāra* or some form of *wār* and *lēra*, *mēra*, etc.; likewise, *dāt*, *guatī*, and others of less frequent occurrence. The question now presents itself, how can these extremely common rimes, such as *nōti: dāti*, be explained unless we admit rime of the penult? Tesch¹ has observed that nearly all the instances of *nōti*, *wāra*, etc., used so frequently in the above rime groups, occur in rime in adverbial phrases as mere rime padding, neither adding to nor detracting from the sense of the line. If, then, such a rime as *nōti: dāti* were not considered good by our author, why should he have

¹ Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Evangelienbuches von Otfrid (Greifswald, 1890), p. 9 f.

used this combination so constantly? Nor can it be urged that there were few other rimes in *-āti* to rime with *dāti* and that the makeshift was due to this fact. For, on consulting Ingenbleek's *Lexikon*, such rime endings are found in abundance,¹ and it, therefore, appears that the rime of *nōti*: *dāti* was not forced upon the poet but clearly chosen. By this is not meant that *nōti* does not occur in rime with other words in *-ōti*, for it does, though not quite as frequently as with the word under discussion.²

Similarly, *wāra* in its various forms is a common rime used in adverbial phrases as a pure rime expedient, and if we ask ourselves the reason for its frequency of rime with such words as *lēra* and *mēra*, a reference to Ingenbleek shows that here, too, it was a question not of compulsion, but of choice. Other rimes in *-ēra* occur often enough,³ and could have been used in place of *wāra* had it been felt as at all objectionable.

It seems clear, therefore, that we must accept rime of the penult in this class of words, and an investigation of the riming penultimate vowels will strengthen this point of view, as the most similar vowels are found in rime together, just as in the preceding category, where this question was sufficiently discussed. It may be added, however, that of rimes between a diphthong and vowel, as in *guati*: *nōti*, the most frequent rime is of *ua*: *ō*, occurring 43 times, in which we may consider either the *ō* and *u*, or *ō* and *a* as riming, both parts of the diphthong being similar to the riming vowel in question.

It cannot be denied that there may be found such instances as *liuti*: *dāti*, *zīti*: *nōti* with tolerable frequency (i. e. 23 and 16 times respectively), where there is little or no similarity between the vocalic elements, but in the majority of cases the aim to rime similar vowels can be observed and intention predicated.

When, therefore, we get the type *zīti*: *nōti*, both words having primary accent and long vowels, I believe that we have

¹ Rimes of *-āti*: *-āti* = 79; *-ōti*: *-ōti* = 35; *-āti*: *-ōti* = 39.

² *nōti*: *dāti* = 19; *nōti*: *-ōti* = 17.

³ *-āra*: *-āra* 18 times; *-ēra*: *-ēra* 19; *-āra*: *-ēra* 28; *wāra*: *lēra* 7 and : *mēra* 18.

the inception of penultimate rime, for certainly such instances as *scīnaz: scōnaz* must be looked upon as rime, and though these are rare as compared to the total number of this class, they, nevertheless, show one of the first steps.

Secondly comes the *nōti: dāti* types, where the similarity of the vowels and their sonority constitutes the rime, and which points the way to the final stage, i. e. identity of the vowels and accurate penultimate rime, cf. *dāti: spāti*.

In our examination of penultimate rime hitherto we have found the final syllable always identical, but we are now to turn our attention to rimes in which the initial consonant of the ultima is different, although its vowel is the same. This latter constitutes a much smaller class than the preceding, the ratio being about 16½ to 1.

We may distinguish two divisions: (1) The initial consonants of the ultima are similar, cf. *wāra: zāla*, and (2) The initial consonants are not similar, cf. *lībe: sīne*. The total number of penultimate rimes comprised under 1 is 355, these forming over one-half of the entire number of rimes in which the final syllable is not identical. The rimes included under 1 are of nasals and liquids, and of *d: n*. They are given below in order of frequency: *l: n*, 94; *ng: n*, 62; *d: n*, 54; *m: n*, 31; *l: r*, 31; *n: r*, 30; *m: r*, 22; *l: ng*, 14; *d: ng*, 10; *l: m*, 5; *ng: m*, 2.

These rimes have been discussed at length under *Ultima*, where the riming quality of such combinations as *d: n*, which might be doubted, was made evident; it is, therefore, not necessary to consider this point again in this connection.

The way in which the rimes are divided will appear from the following table:

I	II	III	IV	V	Total
84	65	73	46	87	355

The larger amount in I and V is no doubt explained by their greater proportion of suffix rime as compared with the other books; in Class I, that is where the final syllable is identical, we found these two books usually lagging behind in point of frequency of rimes, although we expected them to forge ahead

for the reason above given; we here see where, at least in part, this greater percentage makes its appearance.

As in the preceding class, rime groups still hold their own, a few of which may be noted, from the various divisions of this main class:

An inflectional form of *sīn* (poss. pron.): a form of *blīdi* (adj.), 12; *thīnen: mīden*, 11; *thanne: alle*, 15; *manne: alle*, 5; a form of *nennen*: a form of *zellen*, 8; a form of *gimeinen: deilen*, 7; *gimeini: heilī*, 7; a form of *māri*: a form of *seltsāni*, 8; *quāmun: wārun*, 9; *meina: gouma*, 4; *ēra: sēla*, 7; *mēra: sēla*, 6; a form of *biginnan*: a form of *thingen*, 5; a form of *biginnan*: a form of *ringen*, 7; *gange: thanne*, 6; *sindes: heimges*, 4.

The above were cited in order to show the frequency with which a certain rime group is repeated in this small class of 355 instances. An examination of them will also bring out the fact that, as we should expect, there is a conscious effort to bring the penults into rime.

Neglecting for the present the difference in the final syllable, and taking into account the penult alone, we may arrange these rimes under the same rubrics as those given in our main Class I, and we shall see that they conform perfectly to this arrangement.

Corresponding to accurate penultimate rime of the above class, such as *blīde: nīde*, we have here *zāla: wāra*, *inne: kinde*, *sīnu: blīdu*, *gimeinen: deilen*, *biginnen: sinde*, etc.

This type includes 154 rimes, i. e. over half of the total number of the class, which again illustrates the fact that rime of the penult was aimed at as well as of the ultima.

Of rimes in which the initial consonants of the penults heighten the rime effect by being identical there are: *wāni: wāri* (I 15. 23); *niheine: heime* (I 1. 94); *niheinan: heilan* (I 1. 98); *ruarit: ruamit* (II 2. 19); *niheinēr: heilēr* (III 21. 27); *ginendu: nennu* (III 22. 58); *mīnan: mīdan* (IV 26. 30); *seltsāne: sāre* (V 12. 17).

Corresponding to the type *nōti: hōrti*, there are only 3 rimes, namely, *ruame: duanne*, *andremo: gerno*, and *lougneu: goumen*; but such rimes as *thanne: alle*, *zellen: nennen*, corresponding to the type *heilta: gimeinta* are again numerous, there

being 102 instances; the penult ends in a nasal or liquid in all cases.

Of the type *guatī:dāti* there is a very small representation in Class II, only 3 rimes being found: *heilen:thīnēn*; *mārun:thiarnun*, and *waltendan:einan*.

The type represented in Class I by *riati:guati*, comprises here only 4 examples, namely: *ziuro:stuolo*; *diura:eina*; *ziaro:thiono*, and *fuarnun:fialun* (IV 16. 42), in the last of which the initial consonant of the penult is identical.

Of the type *worto:harto* of Class I there are only 5 rimes in Class II: *wanne:mende*, *manne:kinde*, *mannon:undon 2*, *sindes:suimmannes*.

Of the *wuntar:altar* type, where the penultimate consonant is not identical but similar, the rimes are more numerous, i. e. 59; in 3 cases the initial consonant is identical, corresponding to the *borge:belge* class of I, viz., *thanne:thinge* (II 6. 45); *werren:wollen* (IV 14. 16); *stirri:gistelli* (V 17. 29). The final consonant of the penult is in each case a nasal or liquid, and this class, as well as the others above mentioned, has exactly the same characteristics as the corresponding types of Class I, leaving out of consideration, of course, the ultimate syllable.

There occur 25 rimes of the *nōti:dāti* type, such as *wāri:scōni*, *wāru:Rūmu*, etc., in 8 of which the riming vowels are *a: o*, i. e. the two most similar vowels. Moreover, the initial consonant of the penult is in 3 cases identical: *sāre:sīne* (IV 7. 33; 19. 5) and *wāra:wīla* (IV 13. 4), again illustrating the effort to rime the penult, even though the vowels are not identical.

So much, then, for penultimate rime in which the ultimate syllable is not identical, as in Class I, but similar. As regards our second class, in which there is no similarity of the beginning consonant of the final syllable, as in *lībe:thīne*, *sluagun:wārun*, etc., little discussion seems necessary, as it exhibits the same features as the preceding classes and the same aim may be observed to bring the penult into rime. It remains, however, to show in what proportion this rime is found in the various books, and under what types it is to be classified.

There are 269 rimes belonging here, this being the smaller of the two classes. They are divided:

I	II	III	IV	V	Total
74	30	45	53	67	269

It will be noticed that in this class, as in the preceding, Books I and V, and more especially the former, contain more rimes than the remaining books. If the examples for these two classes be added together, the result is as follows:

	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
Class 1	84	65	73	46	87	355
Class 2	74	30	45	53	67	269
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	158	95	118	99	154	624

The question now to be answered is, what part of the penultimate rime of each book does the rime of the above classes form?

Penultimate rime, in all its types, is distributed as follows:

I	II	III	IV	V	Total
804	767	963	948	956	4438

Classes 1 and 2 form the following percentages of the total penultimate rime: I, 19.7 per cent; II, 12.4 per cent; III, 12.3 per cent; IV, 10.5 per cent; V, 16.1 per cent.

What may we conclude from the fact that V, and more especially I, are distinguished from the other books in their more frequent use of penultimate rime in which the final syllable is not identical? May we not assume, on the basis of this evidence, that I and V are of earlier origin? It seems quite reasonable to regard such rimes as *sine: mīde*, *gābi: wāri* as marking an earlier and less skilled period in the career of our poet, particularly in consideration of the fact that rimes in which the final syllable is identical are so very much more predominant. In view of the other stylistic peculiarities of Book I,¹ which are usually explained as due to an earlier date

¹Especially rimeless verses and the use of alliteration. Cf. Koegel, *Deutsche Litteraturgeschichte*, I 2, 23 and 40, and PG² II, 116.

of composition, the evidence above cited materially strengthens this point of view for this book at least, containing as it does the largest proportion of the *wāra:zāla* rimes.

Returning to Class III, we observe how rime groups are still a favorite expedient; to the accurate type of this class belong: *scowon:ougon*, 16; *boume:giloube*, 9; *libe:thīne*, 14 (cf. V 23); *quāmun:gisāhun*, 7; *hōho:scōno*, 5. Rimes of this accurate penultimate type comprise 167 instances, i. e. over one-half of the total 269 of this class.

The following have the initial consonant of the penult identical: *Maria:māra* (I 6. 1); *werdan:werban* (III 6. 21); *gāhi:gigābi* (IV 14. 10); *nāhit:gināit* (IV 29. 9). The other types are so few in number that no rime groups occur sufficiently often to deserve mention.

Type *nōti:hōrti* of Class I, only 8 examples. Cf. *liobōn:thiornōn*, *geistes:giheizes*, *tōthes:heimortes*, etc.

Type *heilta:gimeinta*, also 8 instances. Cf. *stimmōn:kindon*, *erdu;zellu,sorgon:follon*, etc.

Type *guati:dāti*, 6 rimes. Cf. *liebēn:thīnēn*, *sluagun:wārun*, *muates:anluzzes*, etc.

Type *riati:guati*, only 5. Cf. *liobēr:niamēr*, *houbit:fuagit*.

Type *worto:harto*, 10. Cf. *selben:galgen*, *warba:erda*, *alles:feldes*.

Type *wuntar:altar*, 20; in 17 of which the final consonant of the penult is a nasal or liquid. Cf. *werbent:folgent*, *belgan:biginnan*. Cf. also, *werde:wolle* (I 5. 63).

Type *nōti:dāti*, 22 rimes. Cf. *hōhi:dāti*, *sīnaz:gistātaz*, *irlāren:wēwen*, *liobon:ginuagon*. Also *wārōn:wēwon* (III 16. 28).

Type *dāti:hōnti*, 18 instances in which the extra consonant is predominantly sonorous, i. e. a nasal or liquid. Cf. *stantan:scōnan*; *thīnaz:gihōrtaz*; *sīnaz:fullentaz*, and others.

PENULTIMATE-ANTEPENULTIMATE RIME

Before passing to a discussion of antepenultimate rime, we have to deal with a small number of rimes, 104 altogether, in which there is undoubtedly rime between the penult of one word and the antepenult of the other.

A few such rimes may be cited by way of illustration: *folgētun:woltun*; *gīthahtī:ahtōnti*; *nōti:stōzenti*; *nōti:folgēti*; *gieinōtun:gideiltun*; *fārēta:ruarta*; *andremo:ango*; *wurzelūn:bluomūn*; *ougun:giscowōtun*; *umbi:mennisgī*.

As the above instances show, the antepenult is long in every case, thus allowing secondary stress on either of the following syllables. We may assume, however, that it is the ultima that here bears the heavier of the secondary stresses, and that the penult is slurred, forming a mere glide from the antepenult to the ultima. For example, the rime of the first words of the above is a proof that they should be accented thus: *fólgètùn:wóltùn*, as only by such stress can the riming parts be brought into prominence.

These rimes fall into the same categories with regard to the ultima as those of penultimate rime, namely: I. The final syllable is identical, naturally the largest division, containing 60 rimes, i. e. over half the total number.

II. The vowel of the ultima is identical, but the initial consonant is only similar, the smallest class, with only 9 rimes.

III. The vowel of the final syllable is identical, but the initial consonant is neither identical nor similar.

Here are found 35 instances, making in all a total of 104. These are distributed as follows among the various books:

	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
Class I	16	6	16	13	9	60
Class II	5	0	1	2	1	9
Class III	19	1	4	2	9	35
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	40	7	21	17	19	104
	4.1%	0.81%	1.9%	1.5%	1.8%	2%

It will be noticed that Book I contains about two-fifths of the total number, i. e. 4.1 per cent of its total suffix rime is made up of such rime. This is, again, an indication, apparently, of the earlier composition of this book.

In contrast to the type *fólgètùn:wóltùn* we may mention such rimes as *einōtūn:dōtūn*, an entirely common and characteristic type in Otfrid, in which both secondary accents have their full stress, and penult rimes with penult.

ANTEPENULTIMATE RIME

While antepenultimate rime, such as *worah̄ta:forah̄ta*, cannot be compared, in point of frequency of occurrence, with penultimate rime, the proportion being only 1 to 9, it is found not infrequently and is no doubt aimed at; its use is naturally more restricted than that of penultimate rime, because of the greater inherent difficulty of finding rime words of three syllables than of two. In so far as the final syllable is identical we may thus divide the rimes:

	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
1. Accurate.	5	6	9	12	6	38
2. Others.	82	53	64	88	61	348
Total	87	59	73	100	67	386
	9%	6.7%	6.6%	8.9%	6.2%	7.6%

In view of the fact that both the antepenult and the penult, with reference to consonants as well as to vowels, have to be taken into account in this kind of rime, it is not surprising that the possible types of this class as well as those actually occurring should be so numerous. They will not, therefore, here be exhibited in detail. A few examples of both the accurate and inaccurate types may serve as illustrations: *githrewita:gistrewita*; *thegana:segana*; *korōti:worolti*; *habēti:sagēti*; *zisamane:habanne*; *lobōnti:worolti*; *tunicha:diurlīcha*; *klagōnti:sagēnti*; *lobōnti:wonēnti*; *habētun:gīdra-gōtun*; *sagēta:mahalta*; *fillennes:brennennes*; *gizilōti:holōti*; *samanōn:theganon*; *worolti:beranti*; *garota:worah̄ta*; *sagēta:betōta*, etc.

The main accent in such rimes is regularly on a *short* antepenult (*théganà*), there being no stress on the penultimate syllable.

How do Classes II and III,¹ in which the ultimas in the one case begin with similar consonants and in the other with dissimilar, compare with Class I above, in which the ultimate syllables are identical? We find the same types of rime as in I, although they do not occur so often. The statistic is as follows:

¹ Cf. p. 43.

	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
Class II	7	12	9	15	25	68
Class III	32	11	19	23	10	95
Total	39	23	28	38	35	163
	4%	2.6%	2.5%	3.3%	3.2%	3.1%

The total number grouped under these two classes is not quite half as large as where the final syllable is identical; Otfried is, therefore, on his guard in the case of antepenultimate rime with regard to the ultima.

Examples of II are: *gisidili:nidiri*; *theganā:regula*, *himile:widire*; *himile:nidare*; *redinu:nidiru*; *gibilidōt:giredinōt*; *buhila:obana*, etc.

The rimes of the final syllables, or rather the initial consonants of the syllables, are as follows: *n:r*, 19; *n:l*, 13; *n:d*, 13; *n:ng*, 5; *n:m*, 3; *l:r*, 10; *l:ng*, 1. It will be noticed that *n* is much more frequent in these rimes than any other consonant.

As illustrations of Class III may be mentioned: *bredigu:redinu*; *menigī:zuelifī*; *edili:bilidi*; *managi:gisamani*; *pal-inza:drūrēnta*, etc.

Paul notices in these two classes the tendency toward such rimes as *ingegini:menigī*, in which at least one of the consonants of the last two syllables is the same, but the order in one is the reverse of that in the other. If we examine the rimes of Class II according to this principle, we find that nearly one-third, i. e. 19 of the total 64 are of this nature. To make the point of view quite clear we cite in full: *redinu:frewidu*, 6; *redina:selida*; *redinōn:bilidōn*, 2; *theganā:kun-ingā*, 3; *githigine:kuninge*, 1; *offonōro:Judeōno*, 1; *einboronon:widorōn*, 1.

Class III shows this tendency most clearly, for in 36 of its 86 instances both consonants are the same, and in 14 other cases one consonant is identical, as in Class II above. The examples are: *ingegini:menigī*,¹ 28; *githigini:menigī*, 2; *kisilā:felisā*, 1; *managa:stigana*, 1; *managā:theganā*, 2; *managēn:geganēn*, 1; *managan:gilegenan*, 1; *edili:bilidi*, 1. Also, *menigī:gisamani*, 1; *menigu:redinu*, 1; *githigini:hebīgī*,

¹ *g* and *n* are especially frequent in these syllables.

I; *regula: brediga*, 1; *bilidi: fravili*, 3; *manage: zisamane*, 1; *manage: giscrībene*, 1; *managu: redinu*, 1.

The ratio of frequency of this rime is too large to admit of the supposition that it is due to mere accident; it is rather to be regarded as a distinct feature of Otfrid's rime technic, and Paul is doubtless right in regarding such rimes as intentional.

The entire range of antepenultimate rime may be exhibited in the following table:

I	II	III	IV	V	Total
126	82	101	138	102	549
13%	9.4%	9.2%	12.3%	9.5%	10.8%

In Book I we find the largest proportion of this kind of rime, and an explanation is thus afforded as to the reason for a smaller percentage on the part of I in some types of penultimate rime.

The same evidence that was adduced in the case of the latter rime may again be resorted to in the present discussion, and it leads us to the conclusion that, while antepenultimate rime does not represent Otfrid's norm of rime, yet where such rimes do occur they are due to a conscious intention on the part of the poet to bring the syllables in question into rime.

This evidence—to recapitulate it—consists of: I. The frequency of rime groups. The following may be mentioned:

Class I: *forahta: worahta*, 10; *zelita: welita*, 5; *thagēta: sagēta*, 4; *seگانon: theگانon*, 3; *werita: nerita*, 3; *firlorane: giborane*, 3; *legitun: zelitun*, 4; *habētun: sagētun*, 3; *redina: theگانā*, 9, and *redinōn: theگانon*, 7; *thanana: theگانā*, 12; *ubili: fravili*, 6; *obana: thanana*, 3; *furiston: hēriston*, 4; *sitōti: irretiti*, 5; *sagētun: zelitun*, 10; *managēn: hebīgēn*, 4; *worolti: sagēti*, 3.

Under Class II, where the initial consonants of the final syllables are similar, but not identical, we find: *redinu: frewidu*, 6; *redina: selida*, 5; *nidare: himile*, 5; *sidilon: redinōn*, 3; *redinōn: koberōn*, 5.

Under Class III, where the initial consonants are neither identical nor similar, are the following: *ingegini: menigī*, 28; *bilidi: fravili*, 4; *bilide: fravile*, 3; *menigī: githigini*, 4; *redinōn: bredigōn*, 8; *manage: garawe*, 3.

II. The identity of the initial consonant of the antepenult, as a means of bringing this syllable into rime, or heightening the rime effect; cf. *selidon:salidon*. This effort may be most clearly proved from such a type as *samanōn:theganon*. Of 14 rimes of this kind 12 are of *theganā:thanana*, showing that Otfrid resorted to this means as an expedient for securing rime of the antepenult.

Beginning, as before, with the examples of our largest main class, I, we find: *zisamane:sabane* (V 6. 57); *zisamane:saganne* (II 9. 73); *zilōtun:gizeinōtun* (IV 37. 17); *woroltti:worahiti* (II 1. 37; III 20. 156; IV 26. 21); *woroltti:wonanti* (V 25. 94); *ungiwitiri:widari* (III 8. 10); *gigarōtin:gagantin* (I 23. 13); *minnōnti:meindāti* (I 4. 8); *thanana:theganā* (I 3. 26; II. 27; II 21. 39; III 6. 11; 9. 3; 20. 3; IV 7. 1; 22. 19; 30. 30; 35. 21; V 9. 3; 21. 25; 22. 1); *selidon:salidon* (I 7. 24); *zawēti:zeliti* (V 13. 12, 14); *sitōta:sagēta* (IV 11. 26); *zisamane:sehanne* (I 9. 7); *woroltti:wunsgenti* (I 11. 32); *woroltti:irweliti* (V 1. 2); *irworoltti:wegōnti* (I 7. 26); *lebēnti:giloubēnti* (I 6. 6); *gilebētun:lobōtun* (I 1. 126); *druhtīne:dretanne* (I 4. 46); *gihogēti:habēti* (I 9. 22); *gisitōti:firseliti* (IV 11. 4); *firlorane:biladane* (IV 5. 11).

As to our main classes, II and III, it may be stated that they contain no examples of the above, strangely enough, as Class I shows a quite frequent usage, the proportion to the total number of rimes under this class being 36 to 386, or 1:11. While it is true that the other two main classes are much smaller than I, containing respectively 68 and 95 rimes, we should, nevertheless, expect several instances of the above type.

III. Where there is no identity of the antepenultimate vowels, i. e. in three-fifths of the instances, an investigation shows that, as in penultimate rime, it is the most similar vowels that rime most frequently, namely, *a:o*, *a:e*, and *e:i*. Rimes of *i:u* are extremely rare, and several of these are explained by the same rounding influence of a *w* that we have before witnessed in the case of penultimate rime on page 33.

¹ Note the frequency of *worolt* in these combinations.

As soon as such a type as *ságētà: bétōtà* appears, there seems to be the inception of rime; next comes the type *ságētà: hólōtà*, in which the antepenultimate vowels are similar, and finally the accurate stage *forahta: worahta*, with all the stages between that affect the penult.

OTHER OLD HIGH GERMAN MONUMENTS

In order to show the relation of the other Old High German rimed poems to Otfrid, a few words may be said regarding their rime usage.

The following percentages¹ will serve to show what proportion of each poem is made up of suffix rime, and how this compares with Otfrid's use:

Otfrid, 71.7 per cent; Ludwigslied, 54.2 per cent; Georgslied, 58.9 per cent; Petruslied, 50 per cent; Christus u. d. Samariterin, 48.4 per cent; Psalm 138, 40 per cent. That is, none of the poems approach Otfrid so far as this rime is concerned, as we find him using 12.8 per cent more than the Ludwigslied, this containing, next to Otfrid, the highest amount.

As to the vowel of the final syllable, we may perceive the same care exercised as in Otfrid, and only very rarely do we find such vowels not identical except in Psalm² 138, where this is frequently the case.

So far as it is a question, however, of the identity of the entire final syllable, it must be confessed that one finds this much less often than in the rimes of Otfrid, as the following statistic, showing the percentage of suffix rime with identical final syllable, will show: Otfrid, 83.8 per cent; Ludwigslied, 56.2 per cent; Georgslied, 60.6 per cent; Petruslied, 66⅔ per cent; Christus u. d. S., 33⅓ per cent; Psalm 138, 28.6 per cent.

If we proceed as previously, and divide the suffix rimes of these smaller monuments into penultimate and antepenultimate rime, the results are:

¹ See Vos, *Rime Parallelism in O. H. G. verse*, Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve, p. 441.

² This is probably due to its later date.

	Penultimate Rime.		Antepenultimate Rime.
Ludwigslied,	68.7 per cent.		31.3 per cent.
Georgslied,	72.7 "		27.3 "
Petruslied,	100 "		00.0 "
Christus u. d. S.,	64.3 "		35.7 "
Psalm 138,	93 "		7 "

Penultimate rime forms 87.2 per cent of Otfrid's rimes, and antepenultimate only 10.7 per cent, the remaining 2.1 per cent being made up of penult-antepenultimate rime.

There is, therefore, a less frequent use of the former in the smaller monuments, and correspondingly more of the latter, including under both heads, of course, both accurate and inaccurate types. As to other points, we may notice the same method of rime as found in Otfrid, both as to his tendency to rime the prefixes *gi-* together, and to heighten the rime effect by identity of the initial consonant of the penult or antepenult. Cf. *kiscirres:kiscephēs* (Christus u. d. S. 13); *gidanchun:giwanchon*; *giwvar:giṗar* (Psalm 138, ll. 5 and 22); *giborana:berega* (Christus u. d. S. 29); *fāhan:fillan*; *kamaro:kunin-ginno* (Georgslied, ll. 36 and 49); *kuoni:gekuunni*; *lides:lībes* (Ludwigslied, ll. 54 and 51).

IDENTICAL RIME

By identical rime is meant here rime in which the riming words or syllables are perfectly identical in form. With regard to rime of this sort B. J. Vos¹ remarks as follows: "To a modern ear this kind of rime seems objectionable and we find that for the Middle High German poet, too, it did not occupy the same position as ordinary rime. This is clearly shown not only by its low ratio of frequency but also by the limitations with which its use was attended. Identical rime may then be regarded as by nature a makeshift, used mostly where there was a paucity or entire lack of other rimes. From this principle there follows that as the technical skill of the poet developed, his recourse to this makeshift would become less and less frequent. Alongside of this increase in the poet's resources we must suppose that there was developing a finer

¹ Diction and Rime-Technic of Hartman von Aue, p. 60.

feeling for the imperfections of this kind of rime: refinement of feeling for form went side by side with a greater versatility in the employment of resources at command."

Zwierzina¹ assumes substantially this same attitude, and shows with what care the more skilful Middle High German poets avoided its usage, as offensive to good taste.

In a study of Otfrid's rime, the question at once arises, how did he regard identical rime? Was his frame of mind toward it the same as that of the above-mentioned poets, or was it not displeasing to him, and did he resort to it frequently? We know that he uses various other expedients, such as adverbial expressions for instance, to secure rime, and the question, therefore, presents itself whether he perhaps makes so free a use of identical rime that it, too, may be regarded as due to the same exigency; or whether in certain books a decrease can be traced.

W. Grimm² has already enunierated the instances of identical rime, but there are quite a number of omissions, and many of the rimes cited by him have to be excluded, not only according to the definition above given, but also according to Grimm's own definition.³ These cases will be discussed in their proper place. It was such circumstances as these that made a fresh classification of Otfrid's identical rimes and an effort to establish his point of view seem desirable.

We may classify the instances under the following categories:

I. Complete identity of the riming words, both in form and meaning. Cf. *ist:ist; thir:thir; mīnu:mīnu*.

II. Complete identity in form, difference in use or meaning. Cf. *sīn* (inf.) : *sīn* (pron.); *lībe* (noun) : *lībe* (verb); *eino* (adj.) : *eino* (adv.).

III. One rime word is identical in form with part of the other.

A. The riming parts are from the same stem.

a. Simplex: compound. Cf. *rīchi:himilrīchi; kind:thegankind*.

¹ ZfdA., 45, 286 f., "der rührende reim."

² Kleinere Schriften 4, 159 f.

³ P. 31.

B. Riming parts are not from the same stem.

α. Simplex: compound. Cf. *antwurti* (noun) : *wurti* (verb) ; *in alwāri: wāri* (verb).

β. Simplex: secondary syllable or syllables. Cf. *nōte: einōte* ; *sun: herasun* ; *nōt: giredinōt*.

IV. The parts preceding the rime syllables are dissimilar.

A. Dissimilar prefixes. Cf. *firliazi: biliazi* ; *bigē: gigē*.

B. Adverbs in *-līcho*. Cf. *iogilīcho: guallīcho* ; *baldlīcho: theganlīcho*.

C. Compounds in *-līh*. Cf. *sumilīh: gilīh*.

D. Others. Cf. *umbiring* (adv.) : *woroltring* (noun) ; *tharasun* (adv.) : *drūtsun* (noun).

We shall now take up these categories in turn, state the number of occurrences of each combination in the several books, and, where it seems desirable, discuss the instances:

I. Complete identity of the riming words, both in form and meaning.

A. Parts of the verb "to be": *ist: ist* (I 1; II 4; III 2) ; *was: was* (I 2) ; *sī: sī*¹ (III 2; V 7).

B. Pronouns.

α. Personal: *thir: thir* (II 2; III 1) ; *thih: thih* (V 2) ; *mih: mih* (III 1) ; *in: in* (I 1; III 2; IV 3; V 2) ; *iū: iū* (III 1; IV 5; V 1).

β. Demonstrative: *thaz: thaz* (II 1; III 7; V 1) ; *thes: thes* (V 1) ; *thiu: thiu* (II 2; III 3; IV 2).

γ. Possessive: *mīn: mīn* (III 1) ; *mīnu: mīnu* (III 1).

δ. *nīwiht: nīwiht* (II 1).

C. Adverbs: *io: io* (I 1).

Summary: I 5; II 10; III 21; IV 10; V 14 = 60.

Of two other examples, the one, *eigi* (vb.) : *eigi* (vb.) is rejected by Grimm because Ms. F has *neigi* in one case; it has therefore, not been included here. The other instance is found in III 7. 42, *gouma: goumā* (nim es harto gouma, thiz sint thio selbūn goumā). These two words are not identical in meaning and cannot, therefore, with Grimm, be classed under the above category; for the phrase *gouma neman* in the sense

¹ Six of these rimes in Book V occur in a refrain in Chapter I.

of "wahrnehmen, beachten," introduces an appreciably different use of the word from that of the nominative plural in its regular substantive meaning.

The rimes of this class are then, with the single exception of *io:io*, parts of the verb 'to be,' or are pronouns; excluding *mīnu* and *nīwiht* they consist only of monosyllabic words. Their unequal distribution in the various books must also be noticed, for while III, with 21 instances, leads the list, IV, of equal length, has only half as many identical rimes; likewise, II, of the same length as I, has double the instances of I, which contains the fewest examples. While the number of these rimes may seem rather large in itself, it should be borne in mind that this class contains less than one-fifth of the total amount of identical rime. The words used are of common occurrence, and are found, for the most part, frequently in rime. An examination of the rime endings in which they figure shows that Otfrid had three options for rime: (a) another root syllable; (b) identical rime; (c) inflectional syllable. Although accurately riming words under (a) are as a rule limited in number, his preference for them as over against those of (c) is shown by the number of times these combinations occur, the words found most frequently in identical rime being those used most often in conjunction with other root syllable rimes.¹

The fact, then, that there is a somewhat numerous representation of this class, does not necessarily mean that Otfrid had an inclination towards such rime. It seems to be rather a question of rime expediency, an effort to rime root syllable with root syllable, this effort resulting at times in identical rime; but that there is a tendency to differentiate to a certain extent between identical rimes may be seen from the discussion under Class II.

We now proceed to an examination of the rimes of Class II.

¹ *thaz:thaz*, 9; but cf. *thaz:was*, 44; *:baz*, 9; *:allaz*, 13; *:hebigaz*, 7; *:sīnaz*, 7. *ist:ist*, 7; cf. *ist:bist*, 15; *:krist*, 8; *:frist*, 7. *thir:thir*, 3; cf. *thir:mir*, 27. *thih:thih*, 2; cf. *thih:mih*, 8; *:sih*, 4. *mih:mih*, 1. *in:in*, 8; cf. *in:bin*, 7; *:in*, 8 (see under Class II). *mīn* (poss.): *mīn* (poss.), 1; cf. *mīn:sīn*, 42; *:thīn*, 11. *iū:iū*, 7; *thiū:thiū*, 7; cf. *iū:thiū*, 17.

In this class we find complete identity in form, difference in use or meaning.

<i>sīn</i> (pron.) : <i>sīn</i> (inf.) I 1; II 1; III 1; IV 1; V 1	}	= 6
<i>sīn</i> (pron.) : <i>sīn</i> (subj. vb.) III 1		
<i>er</i> (pron.) : <i>ēr</i> (adv.) I 1		= 1
<i>ubaral</i> : <i>al</i> (pron.) II 1		= 1
<i>in</i> (pron.) : <i>īn</i> (adv.) II 1; III 2; IV 4; V 1		= 8
<i>mīn</i> (poss. pron.) : <i>mīn</i> (pers. pron.) IV 1		= 1
<i>maht</i> (noun) : <i>maht</i> (vb.) III 1		= 1
<i>eino</i> (adv.) : <i>eino</i> (adj.) V 1		= 1
<i>lībe</i> (noun) : <i>lībe</i> (verb) III 1		= 1
<i>wīsu</i> (noun) : <i>wīsu</i> (adj.) III 1		= 1
<i>gouma</i> (verbal expression) : <i>goumā</i> (noun) III 1		= 1
<i>wunni</i> (noun) : <i>wunni</i> (verb) III 1		= 1
		—
Total		= 23

Summary: I 2; II 4; III 8; IV 6; V 3 = 23.

Here, as in the preceding class, Book III contains the greatest number of examples and Book I the fewest. The rimes present a more varied aspect than in Class I, not being limited to monosyllables.

The two most frequent rimes under this group are *in* (pron.) : *īn* (adv.), occurring 8 times, and *sīn* (pron.) : *sīn* (vb.), with 6 examples. There are, however, no rimes of *sīn* (vb.) : *sīn*¹ (vb.), or of *sīn* (pron.) : *sīn* (pron.).

These forms are the more interesting because they indicate a tendency on the part of Otfrid (a) to distinguish quantity, and (b) to differentiate between identical rimes. In the rimes of *in* : *in* the quantity is preserved at the expense of differentiation of grammatical form;² whereas, in the *in* : *īn* rimes the opposite is true, as also in *er* : *ēr*, no case of *er* : *er* or *ēr* : *ēr* being found. In *sīn* : *sīn* we find a different state of affairs, for

¹ The only forms in question are, of course, the infin. and the 1 and 3 p. pl. pres. subj. The former appears in rime 33 times, while of the latter, i. e. subj., only 9 rimes are found.

² This fact should be taken into consideration along with the statement under Class I, in explaining the frequency of *in* : *in* and *mīn* : *mīn* rimes.

here we can have a differentiation of grammatical function combined with an observance of quantity. Hence, there was no need of combining *sīn* (vb.) with *sīn* (vb.) or *sīn* (pron.) with *sīn* (pron.). Neither do we find any rimes of *sīn*:*sīn* (noun), where there would be a difference of quantity. In like manner we have *mīn* (poss.):*mīn* (poss.) and *mīn* (poss.):*mīn* (pers.) in preference to a *mīn*:*min* rime.

Class III. One rime word is identical in form with part of the other.

A. The riming parts are from the same stem.

a. Simplex: compound. *rīche*:*himilrīche* (I 1; II 1); *rīchi*:*himilrīchi* (II 2; IV 1; V 3); *rīchi*:*kuningrīchi* (IV 1); *rīchi*:*woroltrīchi* (V 1); *rīches*:*himilrīches* (III 1); *thegankind*:*kind* (I 1); *duam*:*wīsdūam* (I 1); *ummahti*:*mahti* (III 1); *alalīchi*:*līchi* (IV 1); *guallīchi*:*līchi* (IV 2); *heit*:*zagaheit* (IV 1); *wiht*:*nīawiht* (I 1; II 1; V 1); *wurti* (vb.):*firwurti* (vb.) (I 1); *wurti*:*giwurti* (III 1); *wurtin*:*firwurtin* (III 1); *wirdit*:*firwirdit* (II 1); *werde*:*firwerde* (III 1); *ward*:*giward* (II 1); *lāzēt*:*bilāzēt* (II 1); *giheizan*:*heizan* (II 1; III 1); *bihiazi*:*hiazi* (IV 1); *firnāmīn*:*nāmīn* (II 1); *giligge*:*ligge* (III 1); *firbārun*:*bārun* (IV 1); *giang*:*zigiang* (II 1); *gab*:*firgab* (V 1); *ungerno*:*gerno* (I 1); *iamēr*:*mēr* (II 1).
Summary: I 6; II 11; III 7; IV 8; V 6 = 38.

B. Riming parts are not from the same stem.

a. Simplex: compound. *antwurti* (noun):*wurti* (vb.) II 1; IV 1; *giwurti* (noun):*wurti* (vb.) III 3; IV 2; V 1; *giwerde* (wk. vb.):*werde* (st. vb.) III 1; *in alawāri*:*wāri* (vb.) I 1; II 1; III 1; V 2; *in alawār*:*wār* (adv.) I 1; *in giwāri*:*wāri* (vb.) III 1; *wizzi* (noun):*firuwizzi* (noun) III 2; V 1; *wizzi* (noun)*itwizzi* IV 2; *sculdheizo* (noun):*heizo* (adj.) IV 1; III 1; *machōn* (inf.):*gimachon* (noun) I 1; *giberge* (vb.):*berge* (noun) II 1; *firburgi* (vb.):*burgi* (noun) IV 1; *houbit* (noun):*manohoubit* (noun) II 1; *githankon* (noun):*thankōn* (inf.) III 1; *āleibo* (noun):*leibo* (noun) III 1; *fazzōn* (inf.):*liohtfazzon* (noun) IV 1; *annuzzi* (noun):*nuzzi* (adj.) IV 1; *sumilīche* (adj.):*līche* (vb.) V 1; *tharaīn* (adv.):*in* (pron.) IV 1.

Summary: I 3; II 4; III 11; IV 10; V 5 = 33.

In this class the riming parts, in addition to being from different stems, are usually words, or parts of words, that are different parts of speech.

β. Simplex: secondary syllable or syllables. *nōte: einōte* (I 1; II 2); *nōti: thionōti* (I 1; V 1); *nōti: ebonōti* (I 1; III 1); *nōti: regonōti* (II 1); *nōti: gisamanōti* (III 2); *nōti: steinōti* (III 1); *nōtin: steinōtīn* (III 1); *nōtin: warnōtīn* (IV 1), *thuruh nōt: redinōt* (I 1; IV 1; V 1); *thuruh nōt: firdamnōt* (III 1; V 1); *gieinōt* (III 1; IV 1); *biseganōt* (V 1); *gisamnōt* (V 1); *zeinōt* (IV 2); *þīnōt* (IV 1); *in nōt: minnōt* (II 1); *nōt: firdamnōt* (II 1; V 1); *weinōt* (IV 1); *henti: rouhenti* (I 1); *wīhenti* (I 2); *got: bredigōt* (V 1); *bimunigōt* (IV 1); *lante: heilante* (V 1); *lant: heilant* (I 3; III 2; IV 2); *sun: herasun* (I 1; II 10; III 3; IV 4; V 2); *tharasun* (I 2; II 2; III 2); *heimortsun* (II 1); *wīsūn* (II 5); *mammunti: munti*¹ (V 14); *sī: Persi* (I 1); *wīsi* (I 1; III 1; IV 2; V 1); *in giwīssī* (III 1; IV 2; V 2); *firstant-nissi* (II 1); *sō: giwīssō* (III 6; IV 2; V 1); *wasso* (I 1); *egiso* (V 2); *mīn: firnāmīn* (III 1); *mīnu: nu* (IV 1); *dōthes: thes* (IV 1); *nirknāist: ist* (V 1); *lēs: alles* (V 1); *erdringe: gē* (II 1).

Summary: I 16; II 25; III 23; IV 22; V 32 = 118.

In this, the largest class thus far, *nōt* and its inflected forms, mostly in adverbial phrases, are very numerous, riming usually with the third singular present indicative or with the past participle of verbs of the second weak conjugation. Also the noun *sun* with *herasun* and *tharasun*, *sō* with *giwīssō*, *sī* with *wīsi*, *lant* with *heilant* and various other forms are frequent.

Under this heading Grimm classes rimes which, according to the definition of identical rime above given, would not belong here. Some of his examples are:¹ *rehtaz: thaz; fliazantaz: thaz; scīnantaz: thaz; heimortes: thes; mīthontes: thes; nahtes: thes; muates: thes; wīdarstantanne: thanne*, and also *blīdaz: thaz; furdir: thir; sindes: thes* and *lindo: thō*. While Grimm's

¹ Cf. Refrain V 23.

dictum 'Da völliger Gleichlaut der Vocale und Consonanten nicht notwendig ist,' and the orthography of Ms. F² would claim these examples as identical rimes they clearly do not, in view of the well-defined shifting of initial and medial *th* in Otfrid³ come within the scope of our definition of Identical Rime.

A similar observation applies to such rimes as *muates:thes* which Grimm has also grouped under this head. Similarly, for vocalic reasons, *minno:manno*, etc. (which have above⁴ been discussed from an entirely different point of view), and for both vocalic and consonantal differences, *terren:thurren*, etc., cannot be included in this category.⁵ Also *duam* and its compounds in rime with *duan* (inf.) must also be rejected on the same ground.

IV. The parts preceding the rime-syllables are dissimilar.

A. Dissimilar prefixes. Cf. *firliazi:giliazi* (IV 1); *biliazi* (II 1); *bisuīches:gisuīches* (III 1); *bisuīchi:gisuīchi* (III 1); *gilīchan:missilīchan* (III 1); *gisuīkhit:bisuīkhit* (V 1); *bigē:gigē* (V 1).

Summary: I 0; II 1; III 3; IV 1; V 2 = 7.

B. Adverbs in *-līcho*. Cf. *iogilīcho:guallīcho* (I 2); *forahtlīcho* (I 1; II 1; V 1); *driulīcho* (I 1); *giwara-līcho* (I 1; II 1; III 1); *frāwalīcho* (II 3); *hēr-līcho* (I 1); *kraft-līcho* (I 1; II 1; IV 1; V 1); *baldlīcho* (I 1); *gilīcho* (noun) (III 1; V 1); *gomilīcho* (I 1); *blīdlīcho* (II 1); *lugilīcho* (II 1); *drugilīcho* (II 1); *geistlīcho* (II 2; V 1); *ungisewanlīcho* (II 1); *garalīcho* (II 1); *fol-līcho* (II 1; III 1); *wēnaglīcho* (III 1); *jāmarlīcho* (III 1); *theganlīcho* (III 1); *suazlīcho* (IV 1); *liublīcho* (IV 2); *gilīcho* (adv.): *frāwalīcho* (I 1); *kuninglīcho* (IV 1); *forahtlīcho* (V 1); *baldlīcho:theganlīcho* (IV 1); *hēr-līcho:guallīcho* (IV 1).
Total: I 10; II 14; III 6; IV 7; V 5 = 42.

¹ Kl. Schr. IV, 162.

² Cf. *blīdaz:daz*; *furdīr:dir*; *sīndes:des*; *līndo:dō*, etc.; also *muates:des*; *rehtaz:daz*; *nahtes:des*, etc.

³ Braune, Ahd. Grammatik, §§ 167, A. 4, 163, A. 2, 3.

⁴ P. 31.

⁵ Other examples which Grimm includes under this class, and which are excluded here are: *mīnu:urminnu*; *gifnah:nah*; *bibinōta:nōtta*.

C. Adjectives in *-lih*. Cf. *sumilih: gilih* (III 1); *gilumf-
lih: gilih* (I 1); *iagilih: samalih* (V 1); *wortogilih: sama-
lih* (I 1).

Total: I 2; III 1; V 1 = 4.

In the case of the *-lich* adverbs above several points are deserving of our attention:

I. They occur frequently in identical rime, in 42 couplets.

II. Of the above total, 37 are rimes of *iogilicho* and 3 of *gilicho*, neither adverb being found outside of rime; 38 of these are with another *-lich* adverb, the remaining two being with the noun *gilicho*. Furthermore, *iogilicho* is used almost exclusively, i. e. in 34 instances, in the first half line. Of the *gilicho* rimes, two are in the first and one in the second half of the line.

III. The *-lich* adverbs, exclusive of *iogilicho*, appear both in and outside of rime. There is a total of 78, of which 44 are used in rime. Of this latter number 38 are rimes with the adverb *iogilicho*, there being only 4 cases of *-lich: -lich*. The remaining two rimes, not, however, identical, are with the adjective *rich*.

Keeping the above points in mind, we may first ask ourselves why *iogilicho* is limited to rime position in Otfrid? This adverb is not found elsewhere in O. H. G. rimed verse, and adverbs in *-lich* occur only a single time.¹

In the literature of the transition period² to Middle High German we have a state of things similar to that found in Otfrid: *geliche* occurs only once or twice outside of rime position in all the literature examined, and its most frequent rime word is with *riche*; it never rimes with itself, and only rarely with other *-liche* adverbs, differing, then, from Otfrid in the latter point. *Gelich* is found more frequently (in about

¹ *Ellianlich*, Ludwigslied, l. 42, not in rime.

² For the literature examined cf. MSD; Kleinere deutsche Gedichte des XI. und XII. Jahrhs., pub. by Waag, Halle, 1891; Deutsche Gedichte des 12. Jahrhs., pub. by C. Kraus, Halle, 1894; Deutsche Gedichte des 11. und 12. Jahrhs., pub. by Diemer, Wien, 1849. For the *Genesis* and *Exodus* cf. Hoffmann, Fundgruben, II, 9 f.; Genesis und Exodus nach der Milstätter Hs., pub. by Diemer, Wien, 1862; Kossmann, QuF., 57.

one-half the total rimes) joined with forms in *-īch*, it, too, being almost entirely limited to rime position.

The other adverbs in *-liche*, as in Otfrid, are found well represented both in and out of rime, and here again *rīche* is the most common rime companion; rimes of *-liche*:*-liche* are not infrequent, though not found as often as those in *-līch*:*-līch*, which cover one-fourth of the total instances of the latter in rime.¹

In classical Middle High German, as e. g. in Hartmann and Wolfram *gilīche* occurs both in and outside of rime, so that its use is not restricted in them to rime position, as in the literature examined above. It was already noted that *iogilīcho* appears predominantly in Otfrid in the first half line (i. e. 34:6); and if we examine a few of these rimes it will become clear that the appearance of *iogilīcho* is to be explained as a mere expedient for securing rime with the *-līcho* adverb in the second half line. Its meaning of "ever, always" would easily lend itself to this purpose, as the word could thus be added without materially changing the sense of the line. Furthermore, it will not seem strange that we find so many rimes of this colorless *iogilīcho* with the *-līcho* adverbs, which latter occur only 4 times together, when we remember that outside of *rīcho* there are no other rime endings in *-īcho* that could be used with these *-līcho* adverbs. Otfrid was, therefore, forced to some such makeshift and *iogilīcho* was, from its meaning, or rather lack of meaning, the one chosen.

A few examples are:

- V 20. 20. Thara ferit al ingegini: engili menigī
 quement [iogilīcho]: tharzua forahtlīcho.
- II 13. 14. Er wihtes firsechit, : thes er mo zuagisprichit,
 hugit [iogilīcho]: zi thēru stimmu frawalīcho.
- II 9. 14. Siu sint innana hol, : heileges giscribes fol,
 mit thiū sie unsih [iogilīcho]: drenkent frawalīcho.
- I 23. 34. Fuar er mit ther bredigu: mit mihileru redinu
 Joh rafsta sie [iogilīcho]: filu kraftlīcho.

¹ More frequent than the words in these two endings are those in *-līchen*, occurring about twice as often outside rime as inside. Rimes with *-līchen* are common, but *rīche*, *rīchen*, is again the rime preferred.

- II 11. 10. Sō thiū selben kristes kraft: eina geislun thār
gīflaht
ūzstiaz er se [iogilīcho]: joh filu kraftlīcho.
- IV 7. 42. Sine engilā ouh in alawār: sie blasent iro horn thar,
thaz duent sie [iogilīcho]: filu kraftlīcho.
- IV 1. 18. Er zalt iz in ouh harto: offonōro worto
thia sālida [iogilīcho]: filu suazlīcho.
- II 6. 13. Thiū nātara [iogilīcho]: spuan siu drugilīcho.

Examples enough have been quoted to show that if, in the above classes, *iogilīcho* should be omitted in each, no detriment to the sense of the line would result. In many of these rimes neither *iogilīcho* nor the *-līcho* adverb seems of any great importance to the sense of the line; but where something is added it is by the latter. In several cases it would almost seem as if Otfrid had finished out his line so far as the sense was concerned, and then in the space left in the first half line had intercalated this colorless adverb to supply the word to rime with the second half line.

Zwierzina¹ advances the view that rimes of *gelīch* and *gelīche* with other forms in the suffix *-līch* were not felt as identical by Wolfram and Hartmann, and are not to be classed under this category. He remarks: "Der zusammenhang von 'gleich' und der adjectiv-ableitung '-lich' ist heute im sprachbewusstsein nicht mehr vorhanden, und nur der grammatisch gebildete weiss von ihm, aber auch dieser fühlt ihn beim gebrauch der sprache nicht mehr. So war es wol auch schon im 13. Jh., waren ja auch schon damals *gelīch* und *-līch* im dialekt so vieler gegendn lautlich differenciert. Nun reimt Wolfram sein *gelīch(e)*, um seinen tonsilbenanlaut ganz ebenso unbekümmert wie in begreiflicherer weise um seine etymologie, ungescheut auf *-līch(e)*." He then shows that although *rīch* or *rīche* is the most frequent rime word by far of the ending *-īch* or *īche*, with which he could have rimed his *gelīch(e)*, yet Wolfram rimes *gelīch(e)*:*-līch(e)* very often, but avoids riming forms of *-līch(e)*:*-līch(e)*.

He resumes: "Aber nicht nur die verschiedene bedeutung und function des *-līch* in *gelīch* und des *-līch* in der adjectiv

¹ ZfdA., 45, p. 291.

composition kann der grund für Wolframs verhalten sein. Denn verschiedene bedeutung und function haben ja auch *sīn* 'esse' und *sīn* 'suus' und andre mehr und dennoch reimt W. sie nicht. Wir werden also mit notwendigkeit annehmen müssen dass W. *glic̃h*, *unglic̃h* sprach."

He also brings forward similar proof for Hartmann and reaches the same conclusion as in the case of Wolfram.

The fact that Otfrid, too, with his large number of examples of the above rimes, has in nearly every case rimes of (*io*)*gil̃cho* : *-l̃cho*, and only rarely *-l̃cho* : *-l̃cho*, shows a state of affairs similar to M. H. G. usage, but I do not on this account believe that he pronounced (*io*)*glic̃ho*; for it seems probable that the relation of *glic̃h* and the *-lic̃h* suffix was more keenly felt in this older period of the language than in M. H. G., and this would operate against the pronunciation *glic̃ho*. Besides, we have two instances of *-l̃cho* : *l̃cho*, so that this combination is not absolutely avoided, and of the four examples of rimes of adjectives in *-lih*, one is *wortogilih* : *gil̃ih*, which would be identical no matter how pronounced, as would two other instances of *iogil̃cho* : *gil̃cho* (noun). Add to this the still weightier evidence, that Otfrid makes a free use of identical rime otherwise, and evidently views it differently from Wolfram and Hartman, and it seems safe to assume that *gil̃cho* was pronounced as it stands, with no intention of avoiding a repetition of the same sound.

As stated above, the frequency of *iogil̃cho* in rime with *-l̃cho* would seem to be due to the exigencies of rime, and the rarity of rime words with this ending.

D. Others. Cf. *umbiring* : *woroltring* (V 1. 32); *tharawert* : *geginwert* (V 7. 59); *tharasun* : *dr̃utsun* (II 9. 41); *antwurti* : *giwurti* (I 4; V 1 = 5); *urheize* : *biheize* (IV 23. 28); *antwurti* : *ungiwurti* (III 18. 25). Also, *riuwon* : *giwon* (III 10. 7); *gidān* : *Jordān* (III 22. 67); in *giwis* : *biruwis* (II 7. 18).

Total: I 4; II 2; III 3; IV 1; V 3 = 13.

We are now ready to return to our original question: How does Otfrid regard identical rime? If the examples from the various categories be added the total amounts to 337, i. e. 4.7 per cent of the entire poem. From the fact that identical rime

thus occupies so important a position, we may assume that Otfrid felt no hesitation in its use. Its frequency finds, no doubt, its explanation in the convenience of its use for ready rime. It has already been shown how, after having once rimed two words together, Otfrid repeatedly returned to them, although in most cases other combinations were at hand; and the present case is similar, the same purpose being subserved.

Identical rime is divided amongst the various books as follows:

	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
Stem rime.	23	41	46	38	51	199
Pen. rime.	25	30	37	27	19	138
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	48	71	83	65	70	337

The difference between the books offers nothing especially noteworthy, if one bears in mind their difference in length. The firmer and firmer hold which identical rime takes may be seen from the increase from I to II, both books being of the same length.

The procedure is then just the opposite to that of the M. H. G. poets, an increase and not a decrease. It might in fact almost be said that identical rime gradually becomes a fixed mannerism of our poet.¹

¹The remaining O. H. G. rimed poems are too limited in extent to afford a satisfactory basis of comparison with Otfrid. The data are as follows: Georgslied, *woroltrihhi: himilrihhi*, l. 5; Ludwigslied *her* (pron.): *her* (pron.), l. 52, and *was: was*, l. 58; Psalm 138 *mir: mir*, l. 21. It will be seen that, so far as this scanty material allows a judgment, the point of view is the same as that which we encountered in Otfrid.

SUMMARY

In order to present a comprehensive view of the classifications of Otfrid's rimes, the following statement may be given:

	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
I. Stem rime:						
1. Identical,	23	41	46	38	51	199
2. Others,	238	342	446	424	355	1805
	261	383	492	462	406	2004
II. Penultimate rime:						
1. Identical,	25	30	37	27	19	138
2. Accurate,	332	347	432	418	463	1992
3. Others,	448	395	493	509	463	2308
	805	772	962	954	945	4438
III. Pen.-Antepen. rime:						
1. Accurate,	3	2	4	0	3	12
2. Others,	37	5	17	17	16	92
	40	7	21	17	19	104
IV. Antepen. rime:						
1. Accurate,	5	6	9	12	6	38
2. Others,	121	76	92	126	96	511
	126	82	101	138	102	549
V. Rimeless verses:	8	0	0	1	0	9
Total,						7104

VITA

Thomas Howard Fowler was born in Howard County, Maryland, and received his early education in the High School and Washington College, Chestertown, Md. He was graduated from college in 1897 and in the following year took his Master's Degree. He entered the Johns Hopkins University in October, 1898, and after one year of graduate work became instructor in Modern Languages in the Horner Military School, Oxford, North Carolina, where he taught during 1899-1901. He returned to the Johns Hopkins University in 1901 and for four years pursued graduate studies in German, Sanscrit, and English. To all his instructors, and especially to Prof. Henry Wood and Associate Professor B. J. Vos, he desires to express his sincere thanks for the inspiration and benefit gained by following courses under their instruction.

